

**AMERICAN UNITY
AND ASIA**

American Unity
and Asia

PEARL S. BUCK

MAHAB SULTAN JUNG BAHADUR

THE JOHN DAY COMPANY
NEW YORK

COPYRIGHT, 1942, BY PEARL S. BUCK

*All rights reserved, including the right to
reproduce this book, or portions
thereof, in any form*

Fifth Impression

**PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BY THE CORNWALL PRESS, CORNWALL, N. Y.**

CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-----|
| Foreword | 7 |
| 1. Letter to the <i>Times</i> | 11 |
| 2. Tinder for Tomorrow | 22 |
| 3. A Letter to Colored Americans | 34 |
| 4. What Are We Fighting For in the Orient? | 43 |
| 5. Freedom For All | 56 |
| 6. China and Federal Union | 63 |
| 7. The Chinese Mind and India | 74 |
| 8. Japanese Americans | 96 |
| 9. Women and Victory | 105 |
| 10. American Unity | 124 |

FOREWORD

THERE is no reason for putting into the permanent or semi-permanent form of a book a series of articles and speeches except as they represent a trend in thought.

There are certain trends of common thought even in this vast war, which is no single war but a score of combats, each great enough to make a single war in times less confused than ours. These trends proceed, not smoothly and inevitably, but as all growth proceeds, in waves and jerks and shocks of comprehension. So, during the months just past, people all over the world have not only been fighting in a war—they have also been undergoing a violent education. China has leaped into a world position she has never had before. The obscure dark continent of India, which heretofore has scarcely been more than a cloud upon the horizon of America, has become a country of living people. Japan has become a dangerous enemy instead of a friendly power.

The essays in this book were first written as addresses

FOREWORD

or letters on various occasions which were synchronized more or less consciously with the moments of sudden public comprehension of such changes. If as essays these now have any value it is not because they offer anything new in the way of solutions of deep human problems but because they typify, to some extent, a certain progression of common thought in a certain period of time.

PEARL S. BUCK.

**AMERICAN UNITY
AND ASIA**

1. LETTER TO THE "TIMES"

THE editorial in the New York *Times* of Nov. 12, "The Other Side of Harlem," denies the basic cause for the situation in our country of which the new manifestation of crime in Harlem is only a symptom, slight enough for what it signifies. Nor are the constructive measures proposed sufficient. It would be impossible for any accumulation of social welfare work to solve the situation which produces crime in Harlem. We all know that merely to make arrests and impose jail sentences can be nothing but an emergency measure and one which promises no fundamental improvement for the future. But equally palliative are the efforts of welfare workers on the basis upon which they are now organized.

The reason why colored Americans are compelled to live in ghettos, where they are helpless against high rents and miserable housing, is the segregation to which race prejudice compels them. Race prejudice compels

A letter published on the editorial page of the New York *Times*, November 15, 1941.

AMERICAN UNITY AND ASIA

colored people to take what work they can get because there are so many jobs Negroes cannot get. Race prejudice makes and keeps Negroes' wages low because some labor unions will not admit colored labor on the same basis as white labor. Race prejudice and race prejudice alone is the root of the plight of people in greater and lesser Harlems all over our country.

As a result of the effects of race prejudice a very serious conviction is gradually becoming settled in the minds of colored Americans all over our country. They are coming to see that what they have been taught and have believed is not true—namely, that if colored people can be patient and good and show themselves obedient and humble they will inevitably prove themselves worthy citizens and will therefore receive the rewards of full citizenship. They are beginning to believe, and this in very large numbers, that individual or even collective worth as human beings gains them nothing so long as they are Negroes. The hopefulness natural to their race is now changing to despair. Colored leaders are saying today that no amount of achievement will gain anything for the colored people as a whole, and that, moreover, they no longer believe the people of the United States will fight for democracy. Americans may fight to live and do as they like, they say, but not for democracy.

LETTER TO THE "TIMES"

This conviction of some colored leaders and many more colored people is rapidly permeating the whole twelve millions. When hope is taken away from a people moral degeneration follows swiftly after. Young colored men and women today are giving up hope for justice or security in their own country. When this hopelessness reaches down to certain strata in any society, outbreaks of crime are inevitable. We must expect it in many places besides Harlem. It has already occurred in other cities.

The swiftness with which this long-gathering despair has come to a present head is due, perhaps, more than to any other immediate cause, to the refusal of the majority of defense industries to employ colored labor on anything like an equal basis with white labor. To the colored American this is final proof of the hopelessness of his plight, that even in the defense of his country he is not allowed his share of work.

And yet it may be a mistake to say that this denial of the chance at jobs is more to blame than the resolute segregation in the Army or the practical limitation in the Navy. The colored American, thanks to an education in democracy, now really wants to see his country a democracy. When he defends the United States of America he does not want to do so segregated and limited. This contradicts his idea of a democracy. He has

AMERICAN UNITY AND ASIA

grown up a good deal since the World War. And he has not forgotten that war. He is willing to fight and die again, but not for something he does not possess anyway.

The white American is conscious of this feeling now seething and mounting in the hearts of his colored countrymen. But the white American sedulously avoids acknowledging or indeed even facing it. With the same curious blindness which none of us could understand in France, we white Americans avoid the reality in our own country. We do not want to discover the real truth about the colored American, which is that our race prejudice denies him democracy. We refuse to face it because we do not want to change the status of the colored person. We wish to keep him the servant of the white man.

I am, I think, realistic and objective on this matter of race, having lived most of my life among colored peoples. My own ancestry is entirely Southern, and I am very familiar with the problems of white and colored in the South. I do not, however, believe their solution is to be found in what the average white Southerner says, in the familiar patter: that the Negro is a childish creature, delightful enough in his place, who only wants to be taken care of and fed and sheltered and treated kindly. That the Negro in the South often glibly falls

LETTER TO THE "TIMES"

in with such assertions means nothing; that Negro is afraid of his white master and says what the white man wants him to say. The same Negro quickly expresses himself in totally different terms as soon as he changes his locale and is relieved of his fear.

But be that as it may, the real point is that our democracy does not allow for the present division between a white ruler race and a subject colored race, and we ought to make up our minds as to what we want and then move to accomplish it. If the United States is to include subject and ruler peoples, then let us be honest about it and change the Constitution and make it plain that Negroes cannot share the privileges of the white people. True, we would then be totalitarian rather than democratic; but, if that is what we want, let us say so and let us tell the Negro so. Then the white Americans will be relieved of the necessity of hypocrisy, and the colored people will know where they are. They may even settle down into a docile subject race, so long as we are able to keep the weapons of rebellion from them—and these include education.

As an American I should deplore any such thing, and yet the world needs this sort of clarification. Democracy now suffers from vagueness because of the lack of relation between principle and action. With all the evils that Hitlerism has, at least it has one virtue, that it

AMERICAN UNITY AND ASIA

makes no pretense of loving its fellow-man and of wanting all people to be free and equal. Everybody knows where Nazism stands and what to expect of it. Cruel as it is, and dangerous as it is to civilization, it is less cruel, and it may be even less dangerous in the end, than the sort of democracy which is not real enough or strong enough to practice what it preaches. To destroy hope utterly is kinder than to allow it without intending to let it be fulfilled.

The importance of facing the situation between white and colored people in our own country is two-fold—it is upon this rock that our own ship of democracy may go down first, and upon this rock, too, that all peoples may divide into the ultimate enmity. Everywhere in the world colored peoples are asking each other if they must forever endure the arrogant ruling white race. They feel they have been very long patient, but they cannot be patient forever, and they will not. In India such men as Nehru, now again in jail at the hands of white men fighting for democracy in Europe;* in our own country colored Americans, as intelligent and well educated as Nehru, barred by their color alone from an equal chance with white Americans to earn their living or to defend democracy—there is a deep,

* Nehru was released from jail about three weeks after this was written, and just four days before the attack on Pearl Harbor.

LETTER TO THE "TIMES"

subtle, dangerous relationship between them. We are foolish if we do not realize it.

For in many educated colored Americans hopelessness results not in simple crime but in a rejection of patriotism. There are those, and some of them leaders, who favor Japan in the present crisis, seeing in Japan the future leader of all colored peoples in the world. There are those who prefer Hitler to British imperialism feeling that, if English rule over colored races can be destroyed, then Hitler can be dealt with afterward as the less established evil. At home and abroad the white race has the choice to make—whether it will follow the totalitarian principle of ruler and subject races, even to the inevitable end of rebellion and the worst of wars, or whether peoples of all colors will decide to work out ways of living in mutual harmony and freedom.

Such is the situation between colored and white peoples at this moment. It is idle to say that the crisis is two steps off and let us attend first to defense and the present war. Crisis between white and colored is not two steps off—it is close, inextricably mingled with this war, because the war against Nazism carries race equality or inequality as one of its main issues. It does no good that we ourselves keep the issue hushed and hidden and apart from the thinking of the mass of the

AMERICAN UNITY AND ASIA

white people. The crisis approaches, whether white people are willing to know it or not. It approaches in the world, and with that inexorable march our own people are keeping step.

What then should we do if we are honest believers in the democratic way of life? We must move swiftly and at once, and our President should not fear so to move, to do away with the effects of race prejudice upon colored Americans. Race prejudice cannot be taken out of people unfortunately by surgical operation, although it is an evil and foreign growth. Children do not have it until they catch it from older people. I have frequent proof of this, the most recent being through the twelve-year-old son of an American friend newly returned from China.

This white child goes to public school in a New Jersey town. When a class picnic was to be held it was found that the place chosen excluded colored people. To his deep indignation the boy found that his teachers, instead of changing the place, accepted the exclusion and managed by "tactful ways" to see that no colored children came to the picnic. The white boy was shocked to the soul at this injustice in his own land to which he had long looked with love and pride while he was growing up in China. His hurt was personal, too, because

LETTER TO THE "TIMES"

his own best friend happened to be a fine colored boy. "I won't go if Henry can't go," was his right decision.

Nor do adolescents have race prejudice in anything like the degree that older people have. Recently in Texas there were a champion white football team and a champion colored team at high schools in the same city. Of course their managers and coaches would not schedule them to play each other. But the white team went out one morning by secret arrangement and played the colored team. They said to their coach when they returned: "We just wanted to see which of us was better." As it happened, it was a tie game, and, though there is symbolism enough in that ideal ending, the significance of the incident, and of plenty of others like it, is that the boys, colored and white, had no prejudice against each other.

Intelligent white people seldom suffer from race prejudice so severely as ignorant ones, and there are many who would, if they dared, acknowledge that they have none whatever. But too few dare. For wherever the disease of race prejudice is found it is bitter and incurable and dies only with death.

But if nothing can remove race prejudice from those in whom it is ingrained, they should not be allowed to violate our nation's democracy. At least, our government can and should see to it that all Americans shall

AMERICAN UNITY AND ASIA

have equal economic opportunity and that colored people in this democracy shall not suffer insult because of their color. It can and should insist that colored citizens shall share responsibility with white citizens for the welfare of the nation, and thus remove the chief reason for the half-tolerant, wholly patronizing contempt of the white for the colored and thereby build in the colored citizen belief in himself. Democratic government must keep apace of science and realize that there is no basis beyond prejudice for the belief that one race is intrinsically superior to another. Continued injustice may make anyone inferior, temporarily, regardless of his color.

I read with complete approval of every plan to better the conditions under which colored people must live and work. But, until race prejudice is conquered and its effects removed, the bitter fact remains that the colored American knows he will not get a better job for being better educated and better housed or for having in his childhood more playgrounds. He will not be given an equal chance with the white American of his class and ability. Race prejudice will still deny democracy to him.

Are we Americans to go on accepting the stupidities of race prejudice? I know of the oft-repeated wearisome defense. Intermarriage is the fearful specter behind

LETTER TO THE "TIMES"

everything. On that there is but one answer. Are we to deny to 12,000,000 Americans the rights and privileges of our country, and are we to risk our very democracy itself, by maintaining a determined ruler-subject relationship between white and colored, because some day a few white and colored individuals may choose to marry each other?

Is democracy right or is it wrong? If it is right, then let us dare to make it true.

2. TINDER FOR TOMORROW

THE Japanese weapon of racial propaganda in Asia is beginning to show signs of effectiveness. This is not because of peculiar skill in the way it is being used, but because it is being presented to persons who have had unfortunate experiences with English and American people.

Race prejudice continues unabated among white people today, the Japanese are saying. Tokyo radio programs daily send their broadcasts over Asia in their campaign to drive out the white man. They dwell upon white exploitation of colored troops and cite mistreatment of Filipinos by the American military and similar treatment of Indian troops by the English. Germany is helping Japan to stir up race hatred in Malaya, India, and the Philippines by insisting that the interests of Asia lie with Japan and not with England and the United States. "The colored peoples," Japanese propa-

An article published in *Asia Magazine*, March, 1942, and delivered in part as a speech at the Book & Author Luncheon, Hotel Astor, New York City, February 10, 1942.

TINDER FOR TOMORROW

ganda says over and over again in a thousand forms, "have no hope of justice and equality from the white peoples because of their unalterable race prejudice against us."

It will be better for us if we acknowledge the danger in this Japanese propaganda. The truth is that the white man in the Far East has too often behaved without wisdom or justice to his fellow man. It is worse than folly—it is dangerous today—not to recognize the truth, for in it lies the tinder for tomorrow. Who of us can doubt it who has seen a white policeman beat a Chinese coolie in Shanghai, a white sailor kick a Japanese in Kobe, an English captain lash out with his whip at an Indian vendor—who of us, having seen such oriental sights or heard the common contemptuous talk of the white man in any colored country, can forget the fearful bitter hatred in the colored face and the blaze in the dark eyes? Who of us can be so stupid as not to see the future written there? The most dangerous human stupidity has been that of the white race in the baseless prejudice through which even the meanest of white creatures has felt he could despise a king if his skin were dark. Yet, if this stupidity were limited to the mean, how easily it might be cured! But among us even some who are able, even some who are good, are sometimes so blind.

AMERICAN UNITY AND ASIA

The effect therefore of this Japanese propaganda cannot be lightly dismissed. It lies uneasy in the minds and memories of many at this moment who are loyally allied with Britain and the United States, in the minds and memories of colored peoples of Asia. Yes, and it lies uneasy, too, in the minds and memories of many colored citizens of the United States, who cannot deny the charge and must remain loyal in spite of it. For such minds realize that, though Nazism may give them nothing but death, yet the United States and Britain have given them too little for life in the past and not even promises for the future. Our colored allies proceed to war against the Axis not deceived or in ignorance. They know that it may not be the end of the war for them even when Hitler has gone down and Nazism is crushed and Japan returned to her isles again. The colored peoples know that for them the war for freedom may have to go on against the very white men at whose side they are now fighting.

In common sense, if for no other reason, the white peoples ought now to realize the truth, too—that war may not be ended for them either, when Nazism falls. They must face the question: will their colored allies then become their enemies? That they may be very terrible enemies is no idle threat. If the colored peoples fight with reservations in this present war against the

TINDER FOR TOMORROW

Axis and if the white peoples fight with no reservations, the colored peoples will have the greater residue of strength. There may be no interval between this war and the next unless we give proof now of our sincerity.

We must realize, we citizens of the United States, and this whether Britain realizes it or not, that a world based on former principles of empire and imperial behavior is now impossible. It cannot exist. We must make clear our determination for real democracy for all peoples with mutual responsibility demanded of all to fulfill its conditions. Nor can we postpone such decision for democracy by saying, "Let's win this war first." We cannot even win this war without convincing our colored allies—who are most of our allies—that we are not fighting for ourselves as continuing superior over colored peoples. The deep patience of colored peoples is at an end. Everywhere among them there is the same resolve for freedom and equality that white Americans and British have, but it is a grimmer resolve, for it includes the determination to be rid of white rule and exploitation and white race prejudice, and nothing will weaken this will.

We can of course utilize the force of this will if we have the wisdom. Nothing would so nerve our colored allies abroad to put forth their whole effort now as the conviction that white leaders mean what they say about

AMERICAN UNITY AND ASIA

democracy. There is hope even in India that England would mean what she said if she could be got to say it. There are few simple things in this world, but at the moment the simplest, if one is at all familiar with mass thinking among the peoples of Asia, is that our allies there will fight with all their strength for real democracy. But if they are not soon convinced, and by unmistakable means, of the sincere democratic determination of the English and Americans, if they fear that they must be reduced one day to fighting for themselves, there will be many thoughtful men and women who will declare openly what they are now thinking and saying secretly: "Will it not be better for us to come to terms, not with Hitler, who is after all a white man of the most arrogant type, but with Japan, and utilize the military and modern resources of that country to free us from white rule?"

It takes no great practical sense for any colored people to see that even if Japan took the position over them of conqueror it would be easier to get rid of one victor than of several. There could have been nothing reassuring or comforting to our Asiatic allies in the closing words of Churchill's first speech in Washington: "The British and American peoples will for their own safety and the good of all walk together side by side in majesty, justice, and peace." An England, a United

TINDER FOR TOMORROW

States, "walking together in majesty," can only mean to the colored peoples a formidable white imperialism more dangerous to them than anything even a victorious Japan can threaten.

The advocates of an American Union Now with the white, English-speaking portions of the British Empire, "with such other peoples as may be found ready and able to unite," are heading us straight into the gravest war we can yet imagine. What can China, that oldest and most pragmatic of democracies, think of a white, English-speaking union which excludes her at the very start? We may as well present Japan with battleships and bombers as to go on with a union which denies democracy in this fashion. Only Atlantic-minded persons can fail to see that in so limited a union we should already be sowing the seeds of the next war. It does not do to be only Atlantic-minded at this moment.*

The United States and England are at a very critical moment in this war. Our allies, India, China, the Philippines, and Malaya, are waiting for us, whether they tell us so publicly or not, to make clear the stand of the white peoples toward them. Are we all-out for democracy, for total justice, for total peace based on human equality, or are the blessings of democracy to be limited to white people only? The answer must be made

* See Chapter 6.

AMERICAN UNITY AND ASIA

clearly and quickly. To evade the question, to delay the answer, is to reply in the negative. And the United States must take the lead.

For we cannot now trust to English minds, however we admire them, nor to English leadership, however strong. We must think and act for ourselves. If our allies cannot be assured, America may find herself deserted in the Pacific when she supremely needs allies there. It is only natural that England should think first and most of Hitler, the wolf at the door. It is to be expected that English minds cannot take seriously enough the full threat of Japan also to us. Why should they when Americans themselves have not taken Japan seriously enough and do not now take any Asiatic people seriously enough? Pearl Harbor and Manila are today awful witnesses of our ignorance. There will be other witnesses as stern before we are done with this war. If England cannot understand fully our danger in the Pacific, let us not ourselves be misled. We Americans face the Orient as well as Europe, and we face it not as the ruler of a great subject people held under military power. We face an Asia in which we have no long-established power. It is too dangerous for us to accept any estimate of the Pacific except our own. We must for our own sakes give our allies in the Far East confidence in our leadership toward full democracy.

TINDER FOR TOMORROW

But can the United States provide such leadership? This also the Far Eastern allies are asking. Japan is busily declaring that we cannot. She is declaring in the Philippines, in China, in India, Malaya, and even Russia that there is no basis for hope that colored peoples can expect any justice from the people who rule in the United States, namely, the white people. For specific proof the Japanese point to our treatment of our own colored people, citizens of generations in the United States. Every lynching, every race riot, gives joy to Japan. The discriminations of the American army and navy and the air forces against colored soldiers and sailors, the exclusion of colored labor in our defense industries and trade unions, all our social discriminations, are of the greatest aid today to our enemy in Asia, Japan. "Look at America," Japan is saying to millions of listening ears. "Will white Americans give you equality?"

Who can reply with a clear affirmative? The persistent refusal of Americans to see the connection between the colored American and the colored peoples abroad, the continued, and it seems even willful, ignorance which will not investigate the connection, are agony to those loyal and anxious Americans who know all too well the dangerous possibilities.

Today the peoples of Asia are still waiting, still

AMERICAN UNITY AND ASIA

watchful. But they are lending an ear to what Japan is saying because they know there is truth in it. For once, Japanese propaganda is more than propaganda, and they know it. Lies can be laughed off, but truth is a sober thing. Who can blame our colored allies if they have reservations toward us, if they doubt our intention for true democracy for them? Our ignorance of how they feel is dangerous as the ignorance of England is dangerous, as the ignorance of France was dangerous even to destruction. But ours is a peculiar danger, for one tenth of our own nation is colored. Our relation to the colored peoples and democracy does not even lie so far off as Africa or India. It is just outside our doors, it is inside our homes. The deepest loyalties today are not national.

But even if Americans realize our danger, our responsibility, our peculiar position, can we produce the necessary leadership for democracy? What is this division between our belief in democracy for all and our practice of democracy only for some? It is not hypocrisy. We Americans are not hypocritical except in small, amusing ways. Talk to any plain American and he honestly believes in equality and justice and in giving everybody democratic rights. But mention to him the colored man and you will not believe your own ears. This cannot be the same man talking, you will say. No, the colored

TINDER FOR TOMORROW

man cannot have the same treatment as the white man, it seems. "Why?" you inquire. The white American scratches his head. "Well, it just don't work that way," he says, and thereby gives huge comfort to our present enemies the Japanese.

What is the matter with this American? It is clear enough. He suffers from what is called in psychology a split personality. He is two distinct Americans. One of him is a benevolent, liberty-loving, just man. The other one of him is a creature who may or may not be benevolent but who is certainly undemocratic in his race attitudes, and who, on this subject, throws justice and human equality to the winds as completely as any Fascist.

Who can reconcile these two personalities into an integrated being fit for democratic leadership in the world today? If the two personalities were to be found always in separate individuals it would be simple enough—we could go to the mat for the one we want. We could even have a civil war again. But the reason why the other civil war we had never really gave the colored man freedom and democracy is still the reason why we do not give them to him today. The split personality which is America is found not in separate individuals but in most of the individuals of our nation. We are divided in our individual structure.

AMERICAN UNITY AND ASIA

This division in personality is desperately serious at this moment when millions of people in the world are looking for leadership in democracy from us. If we cannot assemble ourselves and provide it, leadership will be found elsewhere. Japan may supply it or Russia may supply it—Russia is justly proud of her freedom from race prejudices. But let Americans be sure of this—unless we can declare ourselves whole for total democracy now, we shall lose our chance to make the world what we want it to be, we shall lose even our place in the world, whatever our military victories are. For most of the people in the world today are colored.

How can we integrate ourselves for democracy? The first step toward unifying a split personality is to realize that there is the split. The next step is to reject the undesired self. We must be willing to see that our inner division has the gravest relation now to outer events, to the success of this war for us, to world events which will shape an entirely new era. Whether it will be a golden age of democracy depends entirely on whether we choose democracy now.

We know this better than we are willing to acknowledge. It must be sternly said that it is the white peoples who have the deepest race prejudices. This is in itself a sign of insecurity and fear. And we do well to be afraid if we intend to persist blindly in our preju-

TINDER FOR TOMORROW

dices. If we plan to persist as we are, then we are fighting on the wrong side in this war. We belong with Hitler. For the white man can no longer rule in this world unless he rules by totalitarian military force. Democracy cannot so rule. Democracy if it is to prevail at this solemn moment in human history can do so only if it purges itself of that which denies democracy, if it dares to act as it believes.

3. A LETTER TO COLORED AMERICANS

I VENTURE to write this letter directly to you, the colored citizens of our country. Some of you may know how frankly and constantly I have spoken to white people about their obligations to you. Now I should like to speak to you of the responsibility resting at this moment upon the colored Americans for the survival of human freedom. For the colored American stands today as a symbol, not merely for his own race in one country, but for the hundreds of millions of other men and women, colored and white, who are waiting for freedom and for the life which democracy promises.

Who are these hundreds of millions? They are the people of India, who on their own soil wait for the opportunity to work out their own national life in their own way. They are the peoples of all colonies in Asia and Africa, some more fortunate, some less fortunate in their dependence upon governments. They are people

A letter sent to the editors of all colored periodicals in the United States and Canada, dated February 28, 1942.

A LETTER TO COLORED AMERICANS

who are under no foreign rule but who are ruled without freedom by certain classes and groups of their own race and kind. They are all those people, wherever they are, who long for a society which gives them opportunities not lessened because of blood and birth.

I know that there are those among you who in natural bitterness think, if they do not say, that it might be as well if Japan should win this war so that the white man would be forced out of the lands of the colored people. But this is to misunderstand the fundamental meaning of this war. It is true that white people say they believe in freedom and still do not go on to make everybody free, and yet the real issue in this war is a single one—it is a war between the democracies who admit the principle that men and women should think and speak and work in freedom and the Axis rulers who deny freedom even as a principle.

If the democratic peoples win, there will be a chance to work out true democracy. If the democratic peoples lose, there will be no further chance for a long time even to try anything like freedom. Japan's whole culture, ancient and modern, is based on stern subjugation of the individual. And there is no reason for anyone to expect freedom from the German rulers. This war, therefore, belongs to the colored American as much as to the white American, and they stand or fall together

AMERICAN UNITY AND ASIA

with the rest of humanity. Never before has race meant so much and so little—so much because it is upon this point of equality that the democratic peoples have failed most disastrously to practice full democracy, and so little because, if the Axis should win, color would not save or damn anyone. The freedom of colored and white together would then be lost.

Faulty as our democracy is, the United States must be the leader in this war for the right of peoples to be free—there is no other leader to whom we can look. We have as our great ally the old democracy of China. But China is not equipped except as we can equip her for a military war. The main burden rests upon our own country. It is inevitable, too, that after this war the United States must be the leader in the peace. China will be deeply concerned in that peace, but there are concerned also the peoples of India and Malaysia, the Philippines, and all the conquered peoples in Europe and Africa. The United States must be prepared in mind and spirit to lead all these toward freedom.

We are not prepared now. The division between colored and white in our own country is dangerous, not only for ourselves, but for that new world after the war to which we all look with hope. You have a peculiar responsibility to that world, a responsibility to think in terms of the whole human race, to think of freedom in

A LETTER TO COLORED AMERICANS

the largest possible sense, and to consider the most likely means by which freedom may be established as a common human principle.

As for the white people of our country, you know them very well. There is one group among them who have no race prejudices. All over this country I know there are men and women who have an honest determination to work for real freedom and equality. They are aware of how much and how wrongly the colored American suffers from racial and economic discrimination. These you must uphold by every means in your power, for should democracy not be victorious they will have to give their lives because they spoke and worked for your freedom, too. If the enemy is the victor, you will return to slavery, but they will be killed.

The mass of the white Americans belongs to a second group. These willingly or unwillingly acknowledge prejudice, but they are beginning to believe in varying degrees that their prejudice is wrong. They are beginning to see or at least to suspect that discrimination on the unjust ground of color works evil, not only to those who bear the burden of discrimination, but to those who harbor it, just as in the old days, which permitted slavery, not only the slaves were harmed but the slave owners too. Slavery is a double-edged knife in any so-

AMERICAN UNITY AND ASIA

ciety where it exists, and race discrimination is the aftermath of slavery.

The third white group in our country is smaller than the second but not so small as the first. It is made up of those white people in whom race prejudice is deeply ingrained because tradition still holds them bound or because their lack of intelligence and economic opportunity demand a class yet lower than their own so that they can feel superior to somebody. These white people are the enemies of freedom. Should the Axis win, these would be its friends. They would rule this country under the guidance of Hitler and the Japanese.

If the American white people belonged mostly to the first group, there would be no need for this letter. The work would be done. Those conditions under which you are now living, rich and poor, educated and uneducated, would already have disappeared. If the American people belonged mostly to the third group this letter would not be printed at all. We would now be fighting on the side of the Axis and against the democracies, and we would be planning a complete subjugation of all the colored peoples in the world.

But the American white people belong mostly to the middle group, those who have inherited or been trained in prejudice, but who because they have also inherited and been trained in the American ideals of human

A LETTER TO COLORED AMERICANS

freedom and equality now find a serious conflict within themselves. For the most part they honestly want to do right, but they are afraid because they see that this right will make great changes in our national life. It is true of all human beings that they dread that which they do not know, and it is especially true when what the white people have known has been a tradition which has given them the advantage.

But still just at this moment our chance of freedom for all people is in these troubled, undecided, yet on the whole honest white Americans, most of whom hate their inability to make practical their belief in freedom for all.

You see how great a thing I am asking. I am asking you to help this uncertain white American to understand you as a human being, to trust you as his equal so that he may be convinced that, if you are given freedom equal to his, you will not think of revenge and liberty only for yourselves but still of ordered freedom and equality for humanity.

I do not excuse in any way those injustices and those cruelties which you have borne. There is no excuse for them. You must neither forget nor forgive them, but rather remember them, so that this remembrance, like the bread and wine, may fill you with fresh courage and new resolve. But when you remember the suffering,

AMERICAN UNITY AND ASIA

which you have not deserved, do not think of vengeance, as the small man does. Remember, rather, as the great remember that which they have unjustly suffered, and determine only that such suffering shall not be possible again for any human being anywhere.

I ask you, colored people of the United States, to stand by this great mass of your white countrymen in this imperfect democracy of ours, where nevertheless the hope of democracy is still clearest. They need your help. By all that you do, help them to see and believe that white people need not be afraid in a country whose citizens, whatever their color, are equal in all ways. Every time one of you conducts himself, as so many of you do, with honesty and magnanimity and dignity, you are helping white men and women toward a real democracy. If you are aware of the struggle in the average white person, you will be patient with him as he gropes toward the meaning of freedom and human equality. It is a difficult and unfamiliar road for most white people, and they are fearful because they are being driven along it by the trend of world events. You will help them to reach the right end more quickly if you determine that, though you will not cease to press for the freedom and the equality in all respects which are your rights without a doubt, yet you will assert those proper demands, not in a spirit of hatred and revenge

A LETTER TO COLORED AMERICANS

and selfishness, but in a spirit which by the very manner in which it shows itself proves you the equal of any human being.

I know that this is no small thing to ask of any people. Certainly it is asking you to be better than the white man has been. But indeed you must be better than the white man has been. For if those who have suffered learn nothing from their suffering, then the world is lost indeed. Who can fight so well for freedom as those who know what it is to be deprived of it?

It is essential now that colored Americans see what the white man cannot see. Your vision must be clearer than his. You must not let him for a moment be satisfied with less than our American ideal of freedom for everyone. For there will be no freedom for the white man either if there is not freedom for the colored. If democracy did not win, the white peoples would have to make themselves into a great standing army, highly trained, constantly prepared to keep the colored peoples subdued, and there could be no greater slavery than that necessity. It is possible, in this grave moment, that in such a place as Australia there might be white people made slaves by their conquerors, just as white people now are slaves in certain countries and no less slaves because their rulers are other white men. The issue to-day is not one of race, colored or white. It is freedom.

AMERICAN UNITY AND ASIA

You who know most bitterly what it is not to have freedom should therefore consecrate yourselves to the crusade for freedom and equality, and you must ennoble the crusade by the way in which you carry it on. It is not only an American crusade—it is a human crusade, and you are in the vanguard of it today and not the white people. Those who have deprived you of your rights and have tolerated and encouraged your irresponsibility as citizens so that you have been injured by patronage as much as you have by injustice, they are the ones who have failed the ideals of our country. It may well be that in the future now very close the peoples of Asia and Africa will look to you more than to any other Americans to see to it that the world does not divide as Japan would have it on the false line of color, but solely on the single issue of freedom for all.

It is you who carry the flag.

4. WHAT ARE WE FIGHTING FOR IN THE ORIENT?

I TAKE it that today there is very little divergence in our American answer to the question, "What are we fighting for in the Orient?"

The answer is, we are fighting to defeat the Axis. But this is a very comprehensive answer, a broad statement of a general aim. Well, then, let us say, as it is commonly said, that, like England, we are fighting for national survival, knowing that, if the Axis wins, our life as we now know it, and as we now like it, cannot go on unchanged. We are therefore fighting to maintain and to defend our standards of living. We are fighting to keep the sea lanes open, and to prevent their control by the Axis, so that raw materials can come in from the Orient, and trade be maintained with the Orient. We are fighting to defend what we have in the Orient, our political and economic outposts.

An article published in the weekly magazine section of *The Christian Science Monitor*, April 25, 1942; the latter part was first delivered at the Town Meeting of the Air, in Town Hall, New York, March 26, 1942.

AMERICAN UNITY AND ASIA

But we are not only fighting for ourselves. We are fighting for our allies in the Orient in the same sense that they are fighting for us—the British, the Chinese, the Dutch. We have, too, a duty in the Philippines which will not be accomplished until we have seen them independent, as we have promised. Furthermore, certainly, we believe that it will be better for the Orient itself if the Allied Nations rather than the Axis Nations win. We believe that, whatever the faults of the Allied Nations in the Orient, what has happened in the past is much better than what would happen if the Axis should rule there in the future.

Though the United States has not actually ruled very much of the Orient, yet even we have had a weighty political effect there, especially in China, and that influence has always been on the side of a China that was protected to a certain degree for self-development in the modern world. Not only the United States but Britain, too, has had a policy very enlightened in comparison to that which Japan has had. In the anger which Chinese felt at the closing of the Burma Road for three months by England in 1940, it is sometimes forgotten how England recognized the new Chinese Government in 1926, and in the years following was voluntarily returning to China some of those concessions and special privileges which had been hers under other regimes.

WHAT ARE WE FIGHTING FOR?

In India, too, whatever the grave faults of imperialism, it must be remembered that under Britain there has developed a strong and healthy national movement through such men as Gandhi and Nehru. These men would not be alive today had Japan been the ruler of India instead of England. The proof of this as a fact is to be found in Korea, where Japan does rule and where no nationalist leader has continued. The true greatness of Britain lies in the fact that though the strongest imperialism of our times has been British, yet that imperialism has nevertheless allowed freedom as a principle still to exist. Under British rule, India has developed as a nation asking today for independence. Under Japanese rule, India would have sunk into a state of utter subjection.

To defeat the Axis therefore is to defeat the sort of tyranny which would forbid the growth of independence anywhere. When we make the defeat of the Axis our war aim, we are then fighting a war of independence on a scale hitherto unknown. We like to think that our victory would establish independence in the world.

This seems very clear to Americans. I wish it were as clear to everyone else in the world, to the allies of the United States, and to its enemies. I wish, for instance, that it were possible somehow to convey to the people of Germany and Italy and Japan that, if the Axis were

AMERICAN UNITY AND ASIA

defeated, they would not be crushed but would share in the independence that we are fighting for ourselves. I don't know the people of Germany and Italy very well, but I do know the people of Japan, and I am sure that if they could be brought to believe that the defeat of the Axis would mean freedom to them, it would have a powerful effect upon them. They believe now that their independence would be forever lost if the Allied Nations win. But we have no way of making our enemies believe that our victory would mean their freedom as well as ours. Naturally enough, they think that if they are defeated they will be crushed. They, too, are fighting for their existence, even as we are. There is no way, it seems, of making them believe that we may both exist on this earth. It is we or they, as things now stand.

But it is perhaps inevitable that enemies so view the outcome of a war. What is more important to us now is what our allies in the Orient think of our war aims. What do the millions of India think, the 390,000,000 of dark-skinned people? What do the 450,000,000 of the yellow-skinned people of China think? These millions number far more than we do. These are our allies. There are also the millions of Russia, our allies against Hitler, but not against Japan, millions of mixed race and no color prejudices. Are these allies of the United States satisfied with its war aims?

WHAT ARE WE FIGHTING FOR?

With the aim of national survival, yes, they are satisfied. China is fighting for her national survival and so is Russia. India is demanding the right to national survival by first being recognized as a nation. The Philippines see their nationhood promised, and they fight for the survival of that promise. So upon survival we are all agreed.

But our allies are not so interested in fighting for the survival of our standard of living. That is our own private part of this war. To the Russians and Chinese and Indians, ours has been a fabulous standard of living as remote from theirs as a millionaire's is from a farmer's. Our high standard of living has not benefited them much in the past, and they therefore are not inclined to be hopeful about it in the future. It is not true, judging from past experience, that when some are rich, all are thereby richer. It seems more often true that the rich grow richer and the poor poorer, among nations as among men. Let us therefore not try to press upon our allies our private war aim of maintaining our standard of living. We might say that they ought to fight to maintain their own standard of living. But that argument, too, if we are wise, had better be avoided. The standard of living in the countries of our three great allies—China, India, and Russia—is already so low that silence is best.

AMERICAN UNITY AND ASIA

But freedom of the seas is a good war aim. Trade helps everybody. Let us therefore speak of the freedom of the seas. Unfortunately, our best customer in the Orient was Japan, and she is our customer no more. China was only potentially a good customer, for, because of her size, her self-sufficiency, and her low standard of living, our trade with her never became what we hoped it would. The same is true of United States trade with Russia. It seems that trade is only at its best between peoples whose standards of living are more nearly equal. England, of course, has made good profit out of India. I believe it was Winston Churchill who once said that two out of every ten Englishmen depend upon India. But as the world has been going in recent centuries, our allies have not greatly benefited by our freedom of the seas. Still, it is a good war aim, and they might profit from it more in the future. Besides, freedom on the seas is a good thing for those who also have freedom on land.

As to maintaining our political and economic outposts in the Orient, I am again very doubtful of our allies. Will they help us to maintain those outposts? No, I think not. Even though we win a victory in this war, I fear we must prepare ourselves for a future which will not allow us those outposts. China is not going to say much now while there is a war going on in which

WHAT ARE WE FIGHTING FOR?

she is glad to have our involvement, but we must not look for her to help us keep any political and economic outposts after this war is over. Chinese make it pretty clear that when Japan is forced to give up her outposts and special privileges in the Orient, every other nation's special privileges and outposts will just be swept out the back door, too. China wants her country to herself, and so does every other people. We are having splendid co-operation from the Filipinos, but do not imagine for a moment that we would have it had we not promised them independence and given them a date for it. I think, under the circumstances, with the allies we have in the Orient, we had better not talk too much about maintaining our economic and political outposts. It would damage the war effort.

There now remains as a war aim the general feeling that it would be better for us to remain in the Orient than for the Axis to gain power there. I believe this certainly as an American, and yet I am uncomfortably aware that among our allies there is not such whole-hearted agreement on this point as I could wish. China agrees with us fairly well, and yet even China has reservations which she will not make known to us at this time. Fortunately for us, she has had such bitter experience with Japan that nothing will keep her from the determination to drive Japan from her soil. If Japan

AMERICAN UNITY AND ASIA

had been clever in her plans for her new order in Asia, she would have treated the Chinese people well while she conquered them, fed them instead of robbed them, helped them instead of ruined them, and been better to them than the white man has been. She might then have won them over more easily. As it is, China will be our staunch ally so long as we are hers. In other words, we may count on China until Japan is driven off her soil. Beyond this I dare not prophesy.

I am an American by birth and loyalties, but I am often asked to speak as a Chinese, because an accident of transportation took me to China when I was three months old and kept me there until only a few years ago. It is wholly accident that I know China rather better than I do my own country. Thus, though it is always a great honor to feel and speak as a Chinese, it would be simpler if I could only be an American. For China, to be accurately interpreted, cannot be spoken for by only one voice. If one Chinese I know, and a very fine and influential one, were to speak, he would say that in our allied cause we can count on Chinese loyalty to the last drop of Chinese blood. That is true so long as our war aim is simply the defeat of Japan. But there are other Chinese. I can think of another one I know, equally fine and equally influential in another way, who would say that China will fight for the allied

WHAT ARE WE FIGHTING FOR?

cause so long as that cause is a truly democratic one and will give real freedom and human equality to all peoples. He would say, this Chinese, that his country is fighting for freedom rather than for the defeat of anybody, and that after the war he and many Chinese like him want the peoples of Japan and Germany to be free, too. For such Chinese it is not enough merely to win a military victory—they want to establish freedom as a human principle in the world.

I should say, if I may speak for China, that this is the real wish of the Chinese people. They are determined to defeat the Japan militarists, but they do not hate the people of Japan. I have been humbled and amazed when I have talked with Chinese, many of them, after all these years of their bitter war with an invader, to discover that they have no hate for the Japanese people. They have a fierce hatred for the sort of man and mind which will invade another people. They will fight forever against the aggressive, military, war-like mind in the world which is responsible for injustice and suffering.

The real passion that I have discerned in the Chinese has been to have a world in which there can be peace and human co-operation. This to the Chinese is a war aim strong enough to have nerved them to a bravery, a courage, an endurance, which none of us has

AMERICAN UNITY AND ASIA

equaled. They have fought without hatred toward the Japanese people, but with intense hatred toward Japanese militarists who have made the war. Their aim is to do away with such men, driving them first from their soil and then from the world.

The freedom of their own country, then, is the first Chinese war aim. If it coincides with our aim to defeat the Axis, very well, it coincides as far as we let it. But after the Axis is defeated, they will still have freedom in their country—no political and economic or military outposts, if you please, belonging to other countries. The Chinese are fighting for their freedom. And in the past it has not only been Japan from whom they needed to be freed.

Will China go on after the Axis is driven from her soil? I think she will only if she is convinced that our war aim means defeat of the fascist principle in the world. If she is not convinced of this, if she sees reason to doubt our own belief and freedom for all and in human equality—that is, in real democracy—she will not continue the war. She will stop and consolidate herself and make herself into a strong military power, in order to be ready for her next enemy. If our war aims actually fall short of real and permanent defeat for the Axis and all that the Axis means, if we are merely fighting for our own place in the world, for our *status quo*, our stand-

WHAT ARE WE FIGHTING FOR?

ards of living, our economic and political and military outposts, our spheres of influence and our mandates and protectorates and empires, then, no—do not expect China to fight for those. She will not. It would be folly if she did.

If we want allies in the Orient who will fight with us to the finish, to the complete defeat of the totalitarian idea, then we must define what we mean by defeat of the Axis. Do we mean defeat of the governments of Germany, Italy, and Japan, or do we mean defeat of the ideas behind those governments? Do we mean we will take the power away from those, to wield it ourselves without guarantees of freedom and equality to all people? Our war aims are not clear to our allies. How can they trust us—after the experiences of history? White men in the past have ruled the Indians, the Indo-Chinese, the Malayans, the East Indians, the Filipinos, and to some extent the Chinese. What guarantees are there that we will not want to rule them in the future? There has been nothing in any statement of our war aims anywhere that gives any guarantee of our change of heart for that future.

I cannot therefore say that the war aims of the allied nations in the Orient are the same. Ours seem simple enough, but are they enough for victory? We ourselves cannot win the victory without our allies in the Orient.

AMERICAN UNITY AND ASIA

And England's war aims in the Orient are very complex indeed—so complex that I doubt they can be stated at all. Britain is a democracy fighting for her empire. If there is anything more complex than that in human history, I do not know what it is. But complexity in war aims at this moment may be disastrous. We ought all to be able to agree on what we want from this war. Then we could really fight with all our hearts and be sure that we are fighting for the common good. As it is, our colored allies—and that is by many millions most of our allies—are troubled in their secret hearts. They will not fight for us unless they are convinced that we are fighting for their freedom as well as our own, their survival as well as our own. For if we see ourselves safe after the Axis is defeated, they do not. They have a past to remember, and to defeat.

It is no simple matter, this matter of war aims. It is very complex, for this war is itself very complex. This war is a dozen civil wars, an interracial war, and an international war on the widest possible scale. And to ignore the true nature of the war is to risk defeat. We must be prepared on all fronts. To ignore one, to suppress one, to simplify by false simplifications, will be to end in disaster.

No, I say, as a Chinese and yet speaking for myself as an American, that no war aim so far stated is large

WHAT ARE WE FIGHTING FOR?

enough for us all to fight under its banner. Can we unite millions of people, from all nations and races, East and West, to maintain the American standard of living, to defend political and economic outposts of the white man in the Orient, to maintain sea lanes so that Oriental raw materials can get to the white man? No! We need a greater rallying point, a louder battle cry, to defeat the Axis.

Is the white man strong enough to sound the real battle cry, to which all can unite to win the war?

It is freedom for all, freedom and human equality. We had better proclaim it while there is yet time, while we ourselves are yet free people.

5. FREEDOM FOR ALL

IN THE midst of confusion throughout the world certain great clarities are now appearing. Perhaps one reason why this war has been so difficult to focus in our minds has been because the boundaries to which we have long been accustomed have faded. It is not so simple a war as the old wars were—wars where the fact that one was a Frenchman or an Englishman or a German told where and what he was. Today to proclaim one's self the citizen of a nation may mean nothing because within every nation there is the enemy. This war is at the same time a dozen civil wars, an interracial war, and an international war of the widest scope yet known.

How then can allies find each other? The best friend, the brother, is he friend or enemy? A man's enemy today may be within his own house. It seems to me there is a password and the password is freedom for all.

A speech delivered at the celebration of India-China Friendship Day, at the Waldorf-Astoria, New York, March 14, 1942, and reprinted in *Asia Magazine*, May, 1942.

FREEDOM FOR ALL

If a man believes in and fights for freedom for all, he is the ally, whatever his nation or race. If he is fighting for the freedom of a group, be that group national or racial or political, then he is the enemy.

It is well to remember this password today as great peoples begin to shift their positions for a tomorrow that none of us can foretell. We can only know that it will not be like today if democracy wins the war. Never again will one race be dominant in the same way that it has been in the past. And yet if the greatest tyranny the world has ever known has been in the white race, the heart of democracy has, in a strange contradictory fashion, been there too.

Let me quote what was said by a Korean a few days ago in Chungking:

“Chungking, March 4 (CNS). . . . An important difference between British colonial rule in India and Japan's ruthless subjugation of Korea was brought out by a speaker at one of the special celebrations held by the Free Koreans in Chungking this week. The speaker, a prominent government official, made the following remarks:

“When success of the freedom movement in India comes none should forget the contributions of Gandhi's leadership and also the truth that this leadership could not even have existed under any but British colonial

AMERICAN UNITY AND ASIA

rule. In the present age of nationalism, Korea, Formosa and Indo-China could hardly fail to have their own Gandhis. But could the Japanese possibly tolerate the presence of such leaders in Korea and Formosa? Could the French tolerate the presence of a revolutionary leader in Indo-China? Naturally they would be either deported or killed. Yet Britain can and has let the Gandhi Movement in India grow for twenty years and allowed the leader open organization and every known propaganda facility. When Gandhi was put in jail, in London there were students and laborers holding demonstrations for his release. When Gandhi fasted all Britain showed concern for his life. The presence of Mr. Gandhi is not only due to his own greatness but also to the comparatively enlightened policy of the British authorities. To be just one must recognize that the presence of Gandhi in India represents not only the honor of India but also reflects the essentially democratic spirit of the British people.' "

Where will the heart of democracy be found in the future? If it is not found in one people it will be found in another. Will it be found in India? Is there a wisdom in the ancient philosophies of India which will make Indians wiser than the white peoples have been, so that Indians will be more able to see the practical values

FREEDOM FOR ALL

of freedom for all? We do not know. We can only wait and watch.

And China—whose people have had, perhaps more than any other, the widest understanding of the common humanity of us all—will their age-old common sense be enough to help them, as they rise to greater power among the nations, to remember our common humanity? Or will they, as others have before them, become more greedy of power as they become more powerful?

We cannot tell. None of us knows, as this old unbalance among peoples is disturbed, whether there will be greater unbalance or less, whether more confusion or more harmony among human beings as these great new-old peoples take their new place in the world. All that we can say is that freedom for all must be established as a principle for all or it will be lost by all.

For our democracy has been marred by imperialism, and it has been enlightened only by individual and sporadic efforts at freedom. Our American Revolution was one of the greatest of these efforts, but in spite of victory we have not been able to maintain freedom for all as a password in our democracy. We have denied it in our treatment of the colored citizens of our country. The French Revolution was another great effort, but France lost the password in national greed and colonial

AMERICAN UNITY AND ASIA

imperialism. China is in the midst of her revolution delayed by the war. Much has been accomplished, but even in China the password could be lost in party politics. India's great revolution has barely begun. Will she remember the password of freedom for all? And Russia, whose great effort has been made, will she know that there is no freedom in the world unless there is freedom for all? Will she stop fighting for freedom when the enemy is driven beyond her own boundaries? Who can tell? Who can measure the spirit of a people?

Yet those who wage this war for freedom must have the widest possible understanding of what freedom means, or it will be lost however the armies win it. Sooner or later there will be war and war again, as there has been in the past, unless this one principle of freedom for all is put into the bedrock of human life, as essential as bread and air and water. If it is a side issue or only a slogan, it is nothing, and what we are fighting for in this war is the same old sickening inadequacy of a few dominant powerful people and all the rest unsatisfied and rebellious and brooding the next war before the ink is dry on the treaty of an unreal peace.

It is a moral issue, this principle of freedom for all, and as a moral issue it is the most practical in the world. If we have learned anything it is that without the

FREEDOM FOR ALL

capacity for moral integrity for a principle no nation continues to stand. Had this one principle of freedom for all been maintained after the last war and all questions measured by it and all problems adjusted to it, there would have been no war today. If after this war all questions again are not measured by it and problems adjusted to it, there will still be no peace. When will we learn that greed and revenge and unjust power over human beings are the most costly and impractical things in the world? They have cost us billions of dollars and millions of lives in the past, and they will cost us that again, if we tolerate a world built on greed and revenge and unjust power.

Freedom for all—that is the meaning of this war or it has no meaning. Where is the Front? Wherever freedom-loving men and women find themselves opposed to those who are fighting for themselves, their own race, their own aggrandizement, their own power, at the expense of other human beings.

But I am very hopeful. These are great days. It has taken the knowledge of what tyranny is to make us see what democracy must be. Democracy is freedom whole—political freedom combined with the freedom that is human equality. Thus India, when she is politically freed, must remove the great human inequalities among her people and establish freedom for all if she is to

AMERICAN UNITY AND ASIA

assume her proper place in the new world. We Americans have exactly the same task as India. Our people have political freedom, but not human equality. Our civil war rid us of the slave system, but it did not give the freed human equality. The people of China have human equality but not political equality.

We are all only partial democracies, and we cannot be sure of victory until we are made whole. But what a great struggle is ours, the most ennobling that the human mind has ever conceived, that people must be free! And if they are to be free as human beings they must be equal.

Today, when we celebrate the new expression of an old friendship between the two great peoples of India and China, I renew my hope in victory, in the future. Three-fifths of the world's people are in India and China—most of the world's people. If they unite with the other democracies to make co-operation the basis of human relationships instead of domination and subjugation, if we unite together to make freedom for all the principle of human government, democracy cannot fail. It must win.

6. CHINA AND FEDERAL UNION

I HAVE it in a letter from a member of the Federal Union group that the exclusion of China from any proposed union of the democracies is now an outgrown idea. This is very important, indeed. The initial step has been taken. The idea of a partial union of the democracies, that is, a union of the white English-speaking portion of the democracies, has been discarded. It would of course have been an absurdity, an anachronism in these swiftly changing times. To exclude China today, to exclude India tomorrow, or perhaps a few weeks or even days hence, would be folly. These are great democratic peoples and may not be excluded from any democratic union.

For those who have any lingering doubts as to China's democratic qualifications, I should like to recommend the reading of a most excellent article by Arthur W. Hummel in *The American Scholar*. There, in very

A speech delivered at a luncheon of the Federal Union organization, New York City, April 15, 1942.

AMERICAN UNITY AND ASIA

short space and in very clear form. Dr. Hummel puts the whole case for China as a democracy. I need not repeat it except to say that, in every essential qualification by which democracy can be measured, China stands the test with highest honors. When we remember the long process by which through history she has achieved her present place, we can see that we have scarcely begun the same long road. Democracy is woven into the very texture of the Chinese mind, as a people and as individuals, to a degree which we have not yet reached. China has known totalitarianism. As Dr. Hummel points out, when feudalism collapsed in China after 255 B.C. China had nearly two generations of totalitarian control, an experience which was almost exactly what Europe is passing through today—ruthlessness, savage control of the individual, every private interest and occupation subject to the needs of the state or to the military. "Government by deception," Dr. Hummel says, "by espionage and by expediency, was openly and shamelessly advocated. Talented men, priding themselves on their realism, abused their talents to write learned treatises on how to govern along these lines."

There was a reaction to this, and the great primary belief in the value of the individual human being rose again in China, as it will rise again in Europe, and China has gone steadily on her democratic way, the

CHINA AND FEDERAL UNION

springs of her democracy never being in the political or outward forms of a democracy but always in the moral teachings of her great men, in the ethics of her free common man, trained and taught, generation by generation, in the teachings of the great.

Today China is democratic to the bone and to the heart. The love of freedom flows in the veins of every Chinese and makes his blood red. The love of freedom unifies the Chinese nation today because it has always unified the nation. Any quarrels were scratches on the surface of this unity, centuries old, of blood and history and national thought and social behavior. Knowing this, we can readily perceive how presumptuous it ever was for us to consider a union only of the new democracies like ourselves. Even England's history in democracy cannot compare to China's.

The only excuse that was offered for the exclusion of China was a pitiful one—it was that as a practical matter it was difficult to find a method of representation in a federation that would be what is called “fair.” That is, since China's population is so enormous, it would not, it was said, be “fair” to go by population. That is, the English and Americans might be outnumbered by the Chinese, and that to some was unthinkable. Literacy, it was thought, might be the scale. But is literacy a fair test for democracy? When we consider

AMERICAN UNITY AND ASIA

the millions of Chinese fighting today for freedom, who can neither read nor write, but who certainly are true and worthy citizens of a democracy, dare we say they should be excluded? Literacy is a matter of chance. It depends on the educational system in a country. We stress literacy very much. China stressed other things more. She has not until very recently considered it important that every man and woman should read. There were other ways of disseminating popular education which put at people's disposal the main facts of their history, their philosophy and their general culture. The everyday Chinese man who cannot read may be and often is much more cultivated and educated than the American everyday man who can read and yet does not read anything of any use to him. We all know, who know anything about books and magazines, that the number of people who actually read in this country is very small indeed. To know one's letters may mean nothing at all.

But I am not interested in the mechanics of how to make a union of the democracies. It can be done if we want to do it, and it will not be done if we do not want to do it. The thing I want to talk about is the state of mind behind the conception that China could be excluded from a federation of the democracies, the state of mind that still persists now when someone says,

CHINA AND FEDERAL UNION

"Of course we want to have China, but how can we ever do it practically?"

In other words, it is a state of mind that at the bottom does not want China included because the Chinese are not Americans and not English, because the Chinese live in the East and not in the West, because Chinese are yellow-skinned and not white-skinned, because in its secret places this state of mind refuses to know that the Chinese are our equals, and that, if they are in some ways inferior to us, so are we in as many ways inferior to them. This state of mind is the fruit of ignorance. As an American I am more frightened of our ignorance of the Far East today than I am of any other thing. I realize that this ignorance unless it is mended will ruin us, if not in the war, then after the war, when the building of the new world, wherein the Far East will demand a place, must be done not by men foolish with ignorance but by wise men, who know the peoples with whom they must build. I find this ignorance everywhere, in the highest places in government, in places where there ought to be knowledge and there is not. I find it almost universal among the people.

Yet it was an American, Henry James, who said, "All life comes back to the question of our relationships with each other." It was an American, Thoreau, who said, "Wherever men have lived there is a story to be

AMERICAN UNITY AND ASIA

told." But we have neglected human relationships as no people on earth have done, and we have been too ignorant in our shallow-rooted democracy to read the story of that ancient greater democracy across the sea.

The fruit of ignorance is arrogance. We have not bothered to learn the Chinese language, not because it was so difficult—a language spoken by four hundred and fifty millions of human beings is not perhaps too difficult for other human beings if they want to learn it—but simply because we have not known enough to want to learn it in order that a great democratic history and a great democratic literature might be opened to us. In our arrogance we have complacently waited for the Chinese to learn English so that we might communicate with them if we wanted to communicate. Today when it is crucially necessary that we do communicate with them, we cannot. We don't know how. It is a shameful sign of our arrogance that our history departments have almost no Chinese history in them, our literature courses almost no Chinese literature, our philosophy departments almost none of the great Chinese systems of philosophy. And our religious schools have been the most arrogant of all.

This ignorant arrogant mind has become fixed in its patterns. It is the pattern which considers anything not American to be inferior—unless it be English. Let us

CHINA AND FEDERAL UNION

examine ourselves and be truthful—it is quite right to love one's country and its ways best of all, but that love ought not to blind us to the fact that what we have is not necessarily the best even for us, or if it is best for us it may not be best for anybody else. There are many patterns of democracy, and ours is only one and a very new one, made especially to suit our needs. We are a diverse people, and we have had to have a political form that would unite our diversities. But are we to insist that the Chinese, a people long united by history, race, philosophy, and social habits, are to follow the necessities of our people in their pattern of democracy? To insist that they must is an absurdity. To deny their pattern of democracy because we do not know enough to understand it is ridiculous.

No, we are too naïve. We must somehow grow up. The world that presses upon us is not a world for the very young. It is a world where adult wisdom is wanted and where knowledge is essential. The Chinese know us very well. Many of them have learned English so that they could study our books and our forms of government and our ways of life, not because they considered our ways superior or inferior, but because as wise men they wanted to know. We need that willingness to learn, not that we need to feel inferior, but that we may know ourselves by others, and so discover

AMERICAN UNITY AND ASIA

whether or not we have bases for feeling superior to others of different races and different patterns of democracy.

At this moment it is necessary for us to rid ourselves of the juvenility which feels frightened to know lest it be proved inferior. We Americans seem to have to feel superior or we begin to be afraid. We dare not inquire whether or not we are superior. We have to bolster up our morale with loud talk that we are superior. We are afraid of this morale of ours lest it desert us at this moment when we need it very much. We may be sure that it will desert us if we do not put it on better foundations. Yet we need not be afraid. We have good patterns of democracy here and ones which serve us well. But let us be willing to realize that there are others which are just as good for the people whom they serve, and that the scale by which we must measure democracies is not the similarity of patterns and the springs from which these patterns were conceived, but the kind of people they produce.

Is the Chinese individual a democratic individual? Yes, to the core. So is the American.

Are the Chinese determined upon the democratic way of life? Yes, as nearly unanimously as anything on this earth can be unanimous. So are we.

Then we have enough to unite upon—a common

CHINA AND FEDERAL UNION

spirit. Upon this a mechanism can be invented, devised, established for the means of union. But let us not think that we Americans alone can devise these means. Chinese should be working side by side with us upon this important matter of union of the democracies. Only by a common effort can such union be made. We need to know what the Chinese have and what they think. They are a reasonable and ingenious people, much more versed in union between human beings than we are.

But of course there is no use in going to Chinese if in the state of mind behind this union there is race prejudice or if there are feelings of national or cultural superiority. The Chinese will discover such a state of mind at once, and it will not be possible for them to unite with us. If there is in us the real desire for union, a desire based upon convictions of human equality, there will be no obstacles, and only patience and knowledge will be needed to make the means.

We Americans have, and I think rightly, a reputation for fairness. When we are not fair we are sensitive to criticism, and we accept it well. What we have to realize now is that we are unconsciously always unfair to persons of colored races, and we must guard against that unfairness in ourselves, because we are entering into an era of new relationship with colored peoples. We are always unconsciously unfair to persons who do not

AMERICAN UNITY AND ASIA

speak English, and we must guard against that unfairness, because most of our allies today do not speak English. We are always unconsciously unfair to persons who are not American or British, and we must guard against that unfairness, for in the world most people are not American or British. We must cease to be ignorant and local-minded. The world has forced itself upon us. We are only one of its peoples, only one of the democracies. We stand, it is true, in a strategic place. Ours may be the leadership in the future but only if we are big enough to take it. And that means we have to grow very, very fast these next few years—we have to double and triple our normal rate of growing. We have to get rid of a lot of childish prejudices and false prides and fears. If we don't, the leadership will be taken away from us by China or Russia or India. Let us not pretend that we can simply go on as we are. We cannot. Today millions of people in the East look to us. But they will not look to us long if we are not big enough for them. They are wise and they are old, and they have been learning what the West has to teach. But it has not been enough. In this crisis they continue to wait, but they will not wait longer than long enough to see what we are going to do.

We must know and demand to know the truth about these other democracies. The true story of the Cripps

CHINA AND FEDERAL UNION

mission to India has not been told us. I believe that England acted with integrity and with true desire to do what she believed right in India. But India and her leaders are men of integrity, too, and they have done what they think is right. India is not to be condemned—we above all people ought not to condemn her—when once we stood where she stands today. We ought not to condemn but to *know*. The story of China has not been told. How many of us who concern ourselves with the important subject of union of the democracies have ever read Chinese history with especial reference to the great story of her democratic development? Or who of us has studied her democratic forms today, not merely the form of her government, but the pragmatic democracy that her people live in their everyday lives?

Let us be wise enough to acknowledge our ignorance, and let us approach this matter of federal union in a new spirit, the spirit which is willing to unite with democracy wherever it can be found.

7. THE CHINESE MIND AND INDIA

I HAVE spent most of my life in that very old country, China. One would have said when I was a child there that nothing could ever change. Customs were fixed, so that I suppose more people did the same thing in the same way than ever has happened anywhere else before. Everyone was married according to the same rules and regulations, wedding gifts were almost always exactly the same, family customs were much the same in every family, and even the furniture was arranged according to the same pattern in every house. You could always tell when you went into any room which was the seat of honor and which was the second seat of honor, and if you were the child you knew what chair to choose and how to sit upon it—not straight in the middle if elders were present, but on the edge sidewise, as though you scarcely deserved to sit at all. Young knew how to behave before old, and servants knew how to behave

A speech delivered at a meeting of the East and West Association in Symphony Hall, Boston, April 28, 1942.

THE CHINESE MIND AND INDIA

before their masters, and women knew how to behave before men. The forms were all fixed, and so it had been for centuries. I remember as a child hearing my impatient missionary father as he longed to put spiritual dynamite under that old China which stayed so calm in the face of his hell-fire preaching.

Once in despair he exclaimed to an elderly Chinese gentleman, "Does it mean nothing to you that if you reject Christ you will burn in hell?"

The Chinese gentleman smiled as he replied, "If, as you say, my ancestors are all in hell at this moment, it would be unfilial of me not to be willing to suffer with them." He reflected a moment and then he added, with a twinkle, "Besides, if heaven is only full of white men, I should be very uncomfortable there. I had rather go to hell where the Chinese are."

So tradition triumphed against the Christian dynamite of that day.

And yet today, within half a lifetime, China has changed. Without the bloody revolution which Russia has had, there has been a real revolution in China which has affected the lives of a quarter of the world's people. Ancestor worship has lost its powers, family customs are flexible where once they were inflexible, marriage laws are changed to an individual freedom, divorce is easy and private where once it was almost

AMERICAN UNITY AND ASIA

impossible, polygamy, once part of the national life, has become increasingly unpopular, women, once almost totally illiterate, now go to school as they like, for all government schools are coeducational from the lowest grades to the last years in university, and the old system of education, almost entirely private, has given way to a widespread system of public education. The government has been changed from a loose decentralized form of democracy to a federal form which resembles our own in plan if not yet in fulfillment. Old country roads and narrow streets have been made into motor roads and over an amazingly wide area you can travel by public bus. I can remember the first railroad inland from Shanghai, and I am not yet very old. And even eight years ago you could travel in China by air, north and south, east and west. There has been a great change in China within a very short time, a revolution of the most far-reaching nature, and yet the world has scarcely been aware of it. Some civil war, so small in extent that it affected relatively few persons, took place. This had not much to do, as a matter of fact, with the revolution. Battles between local warlords were a hangover of old times, and the war with Japan has ended them by uniting all against one enemy.

The result of this great quiet revolution in China is that today China is ready for the modern world. She

THE CHINESE MIND AND INDIA

has not solved all her problems, but she knows what those problems are. Even in the midst of war she has been growing and developing as a modern nation. She will be ready, when the victory is won, to take a place second to none at the peace table. It is indisputable that she will be the leader in Asia.

How did this happen? What has been the secret of China's extraordinary ability to adapt herself, a country so old, so populous, so that she is ready for today? That she is ready is shown, if in nothing else, by the way in which she has waged the war against the Axis. Not one of us, not even England, has the war record that China has today. China has been fighting for nearly five years Japan, an enemy so bitter, so strong, that neither we nor the English has yet been able to hold against her—nor have both combined been able. We have modern weapons, China has had none except the small arms which she is able to make. Yet she held off Japan, even after Japan had taken her coast, and even though there was a fifth-column puppet government in Nanking. Yes, China has grown in strength as she fought. Today she is more of a nation than she was when the war began.

How did this happen? Only a few years ago as a human lifetime goes, I remember China being called the Sleeping Dragon. They used to say, "China will

AMERICAN UNITY AND ASIA

never wake up." China was going to be cut up into pieces by the other nations—we had to help protect her against partition. There will be no more of such danger, you may be sure. I do not see China as a dragon any more, sleeping or awake. I see the modern symbol of China as a clear-eyed young man, an air pilot, ready to take off for the future.

How could it happen? It did happen, and it could because of one thing—the inherent flexibility of the Chinese mind. Inside all the traditional forms which seemed to cloak it, the Chinese mind never petrified. It remained through the centuries a living mind, growing in reason and in wisdom. It learned, and it learned that all things may change, because in China there had been so many changes. It is only the young who think that anything is final. It is only the young who believe in eternity. China is very, very old, older by far than any people on this earth, so old that her struggle for democracy was during the three hundred years between the sixth and third centuries B.C. She is not fighting to-day for her own democracy, but for her freedom and for the right of other newer nations to choose democracy.

Five hundred years before Christ, Confucius taught China the supreme value of the individual, and to the individual his duty to his family, to his state, and to the world. And then Lao-tse taught China that there are

THE CHINESE MIND AND INDIA

many roads leading to the Great Right, and that man must not quarrel with any of them, but he must listen to the variety of opinions that men have and even amuse himself with the variety. Tolerance and mental flexibility became thus a part of the Chinese nature through the ages, taught by the wise men to the people.

Tolerance and flexibility, and add to these a belief in the common man, wherever he is found under heaven, and you have the Chinese mind. The Chinese have never thought of men in national terms and they do not think of men in national terms today. They have fewer prejudices than any people I know. They have no race prejudices against black or white. They are not even generally nationalistic. They tend naturally to think of mankind in world terms, even while they fight for their own freedom. But they believe with all their hearts in the strength of the individual. Confucius said, "You can rob an army of its general, but you cannot rob the least of men of his will." This today is common belief in China.

Let us examine this Chinese mind for a few moments. It is a mind which is able to reject tradition without rejecting principle. It is therefore an eminently practical mind. It is a characteristic of the Chinese mind that it can keep steadfast to the end it has determined upon and yet approach that end by changing means, suiting

AMERICAN UNITY AND ASIA

the means to the end by keeping that end in view. I remember when I first began to drive a car—no small feat for a person used to rikshas and sitting sidewise on a wheelbarrow, and guiding at the best of times nothing more rapid than a Mongolian pony—that I did not get the idea of driving, even after I knew all the technique, until someone said to me, “Always drive at least fifty feet ahead of your car.” That is, keep your eyes fixed upon where you are going, and not primarily on where you are, and you will steer a straight course. That one suggestion pulled into unity all my technical knowledge about driving, and I never had any more trouble.

It is a small illustration of a very big thing. The flexible Chinese mind is inflexible in one thing, its purpose, its direction, the end to which it is driving. It is not a weak or changeable mind—the Chinese have proved that as a matter of fact. It is the only kind of a mind that ever does reach its end. How often great ends are never reached because the minds that are set for them were lost along the way, strangled by their own inability to change the route, if necessary, toward the great end! The Chinese does not naturally cling to the way of doing a thing because he has always done it that way. If a better way presents itself of doing the same thing, he will change instantly. He stays by the old method as long as he cannot think of a better one but

THE CHINESE MIND AND INDIA

no longer. The ease with which Chinese passed from riding in rikshas to traveling by airplane seemed astounding, but not to one who knew the flexibility of their minds.

It is certainly astounding to see how quickly they have changed from resentment against the injustice which has been done them by white men over centuries to being the white man's ally now. They have not forgotten the injustices, but they can put them aside for larger issues. These agile flexible Chinese minds are alive to reason. What is the process? It is put into two sentences in a brilliant article by the Chinese ambassador, Dr. Hu Shih, in the May 1942 issue of *Asia Magazine*. I quote it. "It is true that prejudices cannot be cleared up by argument or logic. But it is always possible that, by analyzing a prejudice into its elemental ingredients, one may convert the unconscious assumptions into conscious ideas and thereby make them open to thought and reasoning."

Now I am not a sentimental lover of China. I know China's faults very well, and I know the long road she has to travel after this war is over. But I know she will travel it quickly because her mind will be wings to her feet. She won't be held back by old prejudices, old stubborn beliefs, old traditions. Her mind, so ancient in time, is young and gay and infinitely

AMERICAN UNITY AND ASIA

practical. The Chinese have no fetishes. There are no first families in China. The richest know that once their families have been poor and will be poor again in the wheel of life. There are no noble families. The highest families may intermarry with the poorest. In Fukien Province, for instance, it has long been the practice to marry young men to the daughters of farmers so that strong, honest young women may bring in their fresh blood. There are decadent individuals in China but not decadent families. There is no blue blood. It is all red.

There are no fetishes of religion in China. A man may be Confucian, Taoist, and Buddhist at the same time, which would be equivalent here to being Presbyterian, Methodist, and Episcopalian all at the same time, with baptism by immersion thrown in.

There are no fetishes of race in China. All men may live anywhere, enter any door, do any work that they are able to do, whatever their color. I grew up a white child among yellow people, and while they thought my coloring unfortunate on the whole, because they considered yellow hair and blue eyes ugly, they did not blame me for it. I once saw a very dark colored man from the United States in a Chinese city, and he was greatly enjoyed. The people on the street remarked on his skin with complete frankness, wet their forefingers

THE CHINESE MIND AND INDIA

and rubbed him to see if he had painted himself or if he were really that color, laughed at him with kindly pleasure and much appreciation of his difference, but no criticism, and then gave him a feast in their best restaurant as a reward for being so different. Individuals the Chinese can hate fervently and even viciously, but they do not despise groups or peoples. They do not even hate the Japanese people today, though they hate implacably the kind of aggressive individual in control of Japan at this moment.

Now this sort of self-confident tolerance and strength can only come out of the wisely flexible mind, a mind sure of itself, and it is because of this mind that the Chinese are going to be greater tomorrow even than they are today. They are ready for anything.

Here are some Chinese proverbs made by the people, and they typify the spirit and mind of the people:

“Be inwardly square but outwardly round.”

And again, “In everything let there be standing room.”

And again, “He who has reason on his side need not speak in a loud voice.”

And again, “You cannot clap your hands with one palm.”

And again, “Without error, there can be no such thing as truth.”

AMERICAN UNITY AND ASIA

And again, "Man is God upon a small scale, God is man upon a large scale."

These are all sayings of people of flexible mind, the mind open to the wisdom of change, the mind which knows that no man is wholly right and none wholly wrong, the mind that waits to hear all men speak, each for himself.

I spend so much time upon the Chinese mind because the Chinese mind is the liberal mind at its most liberal, and liberalism is not fashionable just now. Many people are saying that liberalism is soft, that it is indecisive, that it is muddy and changeable in a day when we need hard clear principles.

It is significant that the people who have most steadfastly and universally kept the liberal mind are today the people who are fighting more successfully than any of us the war against fascism. The Chinese distrust hard and fast minds. They know that, in such apparent clearness, in the so-called practicality of those who do not believe in the liberal mind, there is also intolerance and the will to dominate and the belief that all others are wrong—tyranny, in a word. And the Chinese will have none of it. Through their long life they have learned that the liberal mind is the lighthouse of man's freedom, and when that light is dimmed and darkened in one place, the lamp must be lit again elsewhere.

THE CHINESE MIND AND INDIA

They keep it burning very brightly in China these days as they wage the world war against darkness.

We must learn from these great allies of ours. We, too, are a people born and nurtured in the traditions of freedom. If we have not China's long history in liberalism, we have our own history, and it is not less noble. But it is shorter, and because it is shorter we must not today let ourselves be misled, through our longing for more apparent unity, for more decisive action, into the loss of the liberal mind within us.

For to lose this liberal mind would be to lose the very world we are fighting so bitterly to bring about through victory over the Axis. We shall need the liberal mind, the flexible mind, to live in it. It will be a new world, and the most important peoples in it are going to be new peoples. We must be new people, too. We shall have to learn to deal on terms of absolute equality with colored peoples, for one thing, with the Chinese, who are our allies now and who must be our allies and our friends after the war, too, for we cannot do without them. We are going to have to deal with an India free—but passing through tremendous changes of her own. How much we need the flexible mind today toward India! We in this country are almost completely ignorant of India. We know nothing of India's history or of her peoples, and we know nothing of her life in the

AMERICAN UNITY AND ASIA

last hundred and fifty years. We know of England's troubles and difficulties in India, and they have been very real ones, but we do not know of India's troubles and difficulties with England, and these have been equally real.

Being more than a little Chinese, I see no need to criticize anyone, either England or India. What is any country but a group of human beings, alike in their longings and ambitions and different only in their ways of expressing them? "He who has reason on his side need not speak in a loud voice." "In everything let there be standing room." Let the flexible mind be ready to hear the voice of a human being, English or Indian, black or white.

The flexible mind is the only wise mind. In the world to come very soon, if we win the war, it may be very important to us to have listened to the voice of India, that great voice of three hundred and ninety millions of people. Let us keep our minds flexible and ready for a world that is not the old world but a world in which we, too, must live. That flexible mind, reasoning, will not blame India now any more than it blames England. For what we have today in India is a human situation of the most complex and difficult kind. It is not fair to call Indians unrealistic. What have they had in a hundred and fifty years to make them realistic about gov-

THE CHINESE MIND AND INDIA

ernment and organization? Their affairs have been managed for them, and they have simply tried to feed themselves and manage their individual lives. Beyond that they have had no chance to learn what national responsibility is, nor will they have the chance until they are free and freedom compels them.

No people can learn self-government until they govern themselves. To expect India now in this crisis to have a plan for her own government and to function as free people function when for generations they have not been free is most unjust. When Indians are free they will learn to rule themselves, as everything on earth has to be learned, by experience, sorrowful and bitter, with loss of life and much human misery, but there is no other way of learning.

India is a great country, a great and old civilization, in comparison to which even England is new, and the two are inherently antipathetic. There was a time when England might have won India to her side in loyal admiration and willing dominionship, but that time is long past. It cannot come again. There are historical reasons, but knowing at least some of these reasons I am not interested in them. History is over, and its mistakes lie black on us now, a burden which we must carry while we try to wage our worst of wars. We have to carry that burden with England, and China, who does

AMERICAN UNITY AND ASIA

not deserve it at all, has to carry it, too. But so it is, we accept the fact, and without blame or backward looking let us keep our minds open to England and to India as friends, both, as allies, both. Let us be ready always with the flexible mind that can change with new information, can be ready with new understanding, while the common end of human co-operation toward freedom for all is steadfastly maintained.

The flexible mind will not today waste time in fixing blame upon anybody or in stubbornly trying to punish anybody for past faults. It will ask only one question today in regard to India—what can be done now, instantly, to create trust between the allied peoples so that India will want to fight side by side with us?

We cannot answer this without asking Indians themselves what should be done. Here are some things which some Indians have said in answer to that question, speaking as individuals. I quote them:

“We would like an American commander instead of General Wavell, not because we do not admire Wavell as a man and a military officer, for we do, but because we Indians cannot fight with all our hearts under English command. Memory damps the spirit. But America has stood to us more than any other for freedom of peoples, and we are not afraid of her wanting to be imperialistic towards us. Moreover, we secretly fear the

THE CHINESE MIND AND INDIA

forming of a huge Indian army under English leadership. Such an army might be used later for the maintaining of empire in other parts of the world, as has been done in the past. It has been a cause of great grief to India that Indian troops have been used in Egypt and Africa to maintain empire over other peoples, for it is against our principles as we struggle for our own freedom to contribute to the control over others."

And again I quote:

"We would like an Indian to head the Indian government and not an Englishman."

And again I quote:

"We would like the United States to deal directly with India as an independent people, as the United States is now dealing with Australia."

These are practical Indian suggestions. Now I speak for myself. We hear a great deal just now about the lack of Indian unity, but I wonder if we do not hear too much? There are very strong unifying elements in India which are never mentioned or written about in newspapers. For instance, all the Moslems are not in the Moslem League. There are many Moslems in the India Congress, and the head of it is a Moslem. Upon the issue of freedom all Indians are united. There are of course individual princes and demagogues who, like our own demagogues, are thinking in terms of personal

AMERICAN UNITY AND ASIA

power, but these are in every country. Moreover, we Americans must in fairness remember our own history. With far fewer people, we did not achieve unity for a hundred years after our war for independence. We had to fight a bloody civil war before we finally achieved unity, and then by force. Why now should we demand the impossible of Indians, that they must achieve unity under a government which does not help them to achieve unity? It cannot be done.

Let us face this fact. Britain is not solving the problem of India's unity. Let us ask a question—then why not let India try solving her own problem of unity?

Yet the great difficulty facing the allies now is not Indian unity but how to get India to come to our help. As Nehru has put it, "How can we get the Indian people to know this is their war?"

This is the only question we ought to discuss in regard to India. It is the only practical question. We waste valuable time when we talk about anything else. We have no time to fight yesterday's battles now when today's terrific battle is upon us. We must not blame the British today for the faults of their ancestors, nor, perhaps, can we wait for the British today. The truth is that India cannot go on with the old order, and we had better accept what is a fact, whether we know it or not. The old order in India is already dead. Legal

THE CHINESE MIND AND INDIA

changes have not kept up with history. We are fighting now, not with legalities of government, but with issues, trends, and rates of movement. The discussions in India must be reopened and reopened quickly. India is not isolated now—she is not something that is England's business alone. India is the business of all the Allied Nations, the business of every one of us who wants to see victory for the democracies. Let us not today think of our pride or England's pride or of India's pride. Let us only work for the one practical end which we must attain, India at our side. The details can be worked out if we are determined on this end.

No, we Americans, for victory's sake, cannot let India be none of our business. The democracies must win this war. And as gravely necessary is it that we must shape the peace—not white men, not Americans and Englishmen, but Indians and Chinese and all other peoples who choose freedom must be at our side and equal with us and we equal with them. One of the greatest dangers in this war is the short-sightedness that says, "Let us win the war first and talk about peace when we have got it." We shall not have the peace, nor even perhaps victory in this war, if we maintain this attitude of the inflexible mind. We must face present and future now and at the same time.

It has been one of the strengths of the flexible Chi-

AMERICAN UNITY AND ASIA

nese mind that the Chinese have steadfastly looked to the future while they fought in this present. Even when Japan was getting immense war aid from us and China was getting nothing at all but a trickle of relief from individuals and a lot of talk, Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek exhorted the Chinese people not to be angry, not to harbor resentments. He told them that they were fighting an international war. Long before we dreamed of joining this war he told his people that history would force us to join it and on the Chinese side, because the temper of our two peoples was the same. Therefore, he said to the Chinese, overlook the present in America and wait for the inevitable future. Today the Generalissimo stands as the living personification of the flexible Chinese mind and its eternal rightness.

So much for the way that we should consider India today. What of our great ally, England? She must be our ally no less tomorrow than today. But we must help her, as we try to help ourselves, to have this flexible mind. We can reason together, we who speak the same language.

Not condemnation then, but understanding, is the watchword for us. It is necessary to keep understanding ready for the present, for the future.

Can this be done? If the mind is flexible, yes, it can be done. If the mind is narrow with tradition, if it is the

THE CHINESE MIND AND INDIA

kind of mind that must hate one before it can love the other, then no. We are dependent today on many peoples. We are dependent on China, on Russia, and on India. It will not do to keep the old arrogances, the old prejudices, nor the old ignorance, for the Chinese, the Russians, the Indians will not allow these to rule any longer.

Thank God there are already flexible minds in England. My own admiration for England has greatly increased in these days because of what some Englishmen are. Here is an example of the flexible, liberal mind at its best, and it speaks with the voice of an Englishman, in England, and it is England's greatness that he can still speak freely:

From The New Statesman and Nation, Feb. 28, 1942

Something that must, for good or evil, decide our future and that of Asia, happened last week in Delhi, when Marshal Chiang Kai-shek addressed his final appeal to us and to the Indians. Though Chinese civilization is much more careful of the courtesies and decorums of life than our own, he bluntly asked us to concede to the Indians "real political power." It is probable that in confidence behind the scenes the same advice has come from the other ally more deeply concerned in the struggle against Japanese Imperialism. The Americans realize as clearly as the Chinese the need for the whole-hearted participation of a free Indian nation if this struggle is to be won. If we continue to tie one of our arms behind our back, at the best it will be

AMERICAN UNITY AND ASIA

long and doubtful. Something, we do not doubt, Mr. Churchill is now willing to concede, but the usual risk confronts us that he will yield too little and too late. This problem cannot be solved if his traditional England supposes that at the end of this war, with the aid of the Chinese, Americans and Dutch, it is going to recover its traditional Empire, in which everything will go on as before. That traditional Empire had two pillars—firstly, our sea power, and secondly our monopoly among these Asiatic peoples of modern mechanical techniques in industry and war. Sea power in isolation is today less decisive than we liked to think it, and Asiatics can overtake us and pass us in modern technology. Our reverses in Malaya and Burma mean not merely that on the spot we were ill-prepared and ill-led; they mean that by our own faults of racial arrogance and aloofness our leadership over these peoples has passed from us. We may, if we have the grace to mend our ways, become in the future their allies, friends and helpers, but only on condition that we abandon our traditional claim to rule over them. When, after a hard and prolonged struggle, Japan is beaten, two great Asiatic Powers will hold the future of this part of the world in their hands. One of them will be China, which has already welded her national unity during her five years' struggle for survival. The other will be India, if we permit her to come to life. Round them inevitably the weaker Asiatic peoples, from Persia to Indo-China, will group themselves. Australia, meanwhile, may have learned that her ties with the United States are at least as vital to her as her links with London. An organized world order must come into being but will it necessarily follow the old pattern of Empire and Commonwealth?

THE CHINESE MIND AND INDIA

Such minds in England, in China, in our country, in India, and wherever they are found, these are the minds that must and will create the new age, the age that victory will bring us.

8. JAPANESE AMERICANS

I do not know a more difficult position than that in which Americans of Japanese blood find themselves today—people who are American, some of them by birth, some of them by sympathy and conviction, but whose blood is Japanese. It is even more difficult than the position of German Americans, for people of German ancestry have been historically a part of our country. We have admitted Germans freely to our shores and, when we were not at war with them, have welcomed them as our citizens. But the unjust barriers of race have always been raised between Japan and ourselves, so that even in times of peace Americans of Japanese ancestry have had a burden to bear in our country. Now when we are at war with Japan this burden is a hundred times heavier to bear than it has ever been. Japan is our enemy. She has chosen a way of life which is not our way, and her way and ours cannot live in the world side by side. We know the world must be

A speech delivered at a victory rally of the Japanese American Committee on Democracy, in New York, April 15, 1942.

JAPANESE AMERICANS

free, and we are committed to freedom, our own and that of all mankind. Freedom must be the law. We cannot and will not see a world where the military fascist mind is the ruler. We are enemies to that mind.

I know that the Japanese Americans of whom I speak are enemies, too, of that mind. They hate the Japanese mind that is waging this war of Japanese aggression. But even those Japanese who are most loyal to our democratic cause and to the American government and American people must bear the added burden of doubt and suspicion. The burden of proof rests upon any Japanese, and for the moment there is no way of removing this burden of proof. It will grow heavier because of Japan's victories.

Let us face the full truth of the possibilities of extreme injustice that may be done. Ignorant persons in their anger at Japanese successes may wreak a childish vengeance upon any Japanese American who may happen to be living near them. The population of any country includes many childish persons, persons whose bodies are full grown and strong but whose minds are half-developed and unable to reason or to control their own prejudices. When such acts happen I beg you, Japanese Americans, that you will not despair of democracy in America. Remember that we are all suffering in a sense today from the ignorance of undeveloped

AMERICAN UNITY AND ASIA

individuals. The mind of Hitler, a clever and warped mind, is an undeveloped mind, a mind unable to reason, a mind blind to moral right, to justice. Japan today *is being ruled by such minds, however shrewd, still* minds undeveloped because they are blind to what is right and what is just to the individual. We have these minds in America, too, among the high and among the low. They are full of prejudices. They want to wreak vengeance, however unjustly, and we all suffer from them. Our nation suffers. Remember this when these ignorant persons make you suffer, especially at this moment. Say to yourself, this is not America—this is a man, ignorant, undeveloped, who does not himself understand what he is doing. He only happens to be in America, too, as he is everywhere.

And it is true, too, that we must be vigilant for those Japanese who are not Americans, who are secretly working for the enemy. These must be found and dealt with as individuals dangerous to our democracy.

The test of your loyalty to democracy will be in the manner in which you bear the necessities of discovering the disloyal individual and the possible doubts which will be visited upon many of you unjustly. The test will be, too, in the way in which you endure the acts of undemocratic persons toward you. If you truly believe in democracy, if you are really loyal to the best

JAPANESE AMERICANS

for which America stands today, you will not swerve in your loyalty because some unworthy American citizen offers you an insult in the way he behaves toward you. Remember that there are millions of other American citizens who believe in justice and fairness and equality and that these are the true Americans.

One of the deepest and most moving experiences of my life has been this year in relation to Japanese Americans. I have seen them as people so bewildered, so distressed, so torn that I have nothing but sympathy toward them.

I know Japan very well. I have lived in Japan for months at a time, and all through my life, even in my childhood, I visited in Japan at intervals. The Japanese landscape was only a little less familiar to me than the Chinese landscape, and I was accustomed to Japanese people and to Japanese ways of life. I knew from personal experience the best and the worst of Japan.

There was never at any time during the years of my understanding of Japan a doubt of the power in the Japanese. The Japanese are temperamentally able and creative. Even in times of peace the American people underestimated the Japanese people. They are not imitative, weak, or lacking in modern skills and force. They are a people who equal any in creative genius and in the practical ability to operate the skills which their

AMERICAN UNITY AND ASIA

genius invents. This we are beginning to discover to our great cost in war. There is no sense in minimizing the strength of our enemy. Let us face the truth—we have in Japan a formidable foe and one whom, though we must conquer, we shall not conquer except with great effort. I wish that this strong and brave and determined enemy of ours could have been our friend instead of our enemy.

All the beauty of Japan is in my memory, and Japan is one of the most physically beautiful countries in the world, not only naturally, but because the people love their country and have tended it as they tend a garden. It is literally beautiful everywhere except where modern industry has created its ugly and foreign buildings. The native Japan is something which must not be forgotten, because beauty should be remembered.

The Japanese people, too, cannot be hated by those who know them. It is not meaningless that they have been able to create such great natural beauty in their surroundings. That beauty has been in a measure the outgrowth of their minds and their civilization. Perhaps the very beauty of Japan is an expression of the inner repression which people have felt there for so long. Denied creative outlet in life, they have developed it in nature. They have not been free.

The evil that is happening today in the world be-

JAPANESE AMERICANS

cause of Japan is no sudden thing—it is not the behavior of a group of tyrants who have suddenly seized the power in Japan. It is not so simple as a group of bandits who have somehow to be dislodged and punished. The aggressive cruel spirit of Japan's modern leaders is the result of a very deep fault in Japanese civilization. It is the result of a lack of democracy which is ingrained in Japanese life and has been for centuries. Long ago the people of Japan should have rebelled against tyranny, the tyranny of emperor worship, the tyranny which glorifies war and force and death. That the people obeyed rather than rebelled, that they followed rather than led, that through centuries they have allowed themselves to be kept asleep by the fetishes and slogans and systems of religion and ethics which have robbed them of the power to think now, or even, it seems, to rebel—this is the sin of the Japanese people. I will not try to excuse it. But the blame for it cannot be laid on this generation alone. It has been the process of centuries, and this generation was born dead to freedom. What we have today is a Japan where every democratic process is impossible, where freedom of thought is impossible, where spiritual growth is impossible, where democracy is impossible. If it is true that people deserve the leadership they have allowed to develop, it is equally true that the leaders of Japan today are the

AMERICAN UNITY AND ASIA

result of a national life long rooted in fixed tyrannies of many sorts. They are inevitably our enemies.

But these Japanese Americans for whom I speak are not our enemies. They have come out from Japan. They have become Americans, because Japan could no longer be their country. They have chosen our country, a democracy, for theirs. Some of them have chosen to come here themselves, some of them are here because their parents came, and they themselves were born here and have grown up as a part of America. They are here because they do not want to go back to Japan. They cannot go back to Japan. They do not believe in what Japan is. There is no home for them in Japan any more.

What is our duty to them? It is more than a duty, it is an opportunity. Here are Japanese Americans who are alien to the spirit in Japan today, who are far closer to us than they are to Japan, who are indeed American. Let us show them what America is, teach them by our words and our behavior what democracy means, what justice to all men is, what freedom means for the individual. Let us show them the best side of America, the true America, so that they will not be discouraged in their faith in democracy but encouraged and strengthened and inspired.

They can be of great service to the democracies, for

JAPANESE AMERICANS

the Japanese in Japan are going to need a lot of help on that day when the democracies have won the victory. The Japanese people are used to being led. They will not know how to lead themselves. They will be bewildered and confused by defeat, they will not know how to shape a new government and a new life. Democracy is something they know nothing about and have not even heard about. New leaders will not be found in Japan. They must be sent there.

And whom shall we send if we do not send these Japanese who are Americans? They will be able as no one else will ever be to make of Japan a country ready to take her proper place in the new world, the world of freedom for all.

This is our opportunity today. Let us make the most of it. Let us not simply shut up in isolation or condemn to loneliness of spirit any Japanese whom we happen to find on our land, regardless of whether he is American or not. That is the sort of thing fascism does, blind, simple, stupid, unreasoning. No, let us remember that among these Japanese may be the Americans who one day will be able to make Japan ready for the sort of world we want after the war. It depends on us and how we prepare those future leaders, who may be here in our midst at this very moment, as Sun Yat-sen, the father of the Chinese revolution, was once the obscure son of

AMERICAN UNITY AND ASIA

an obscure merchant, and in this country unrecognized and unaided. He did not find here what might have helped China to have prepared better for the cruel struggle she is now having. Let us not make the same mistake again.

To train Japan's future leaders—can there be a greater chance for democracy?

9. WOMEN AND VICTORY

WAR is the great dividing force between men and women. It always has been from the days when women were left at home to spin and knights went out to crusade. That today women do their spinning in factories and at home-defense jobs does not lessen the separation or make the spinning any less spinning. Whatever is devised for women to do in this war, it will be work which deepens the separation and makes men and women into two distinct groups in our people. It is inevitable, and so long as war continues nothing can be done about this effect of any war upon a people.

It will be a separation more marked in this war perhaps than ever before, and in this nation more than any other. Let us be practical about the matter. We all know our side must win in this war, and every sacrifice must be made, and we know we make these sacrifices willingly. But here is the sacrifice for American women—American men are to be sent and are being sent in

A speech delivered before the American Association of University Women, Philadelphia, April 20, 1942.

AMERICAN UNITY AND ASIA

expeditionary forces to many parts of the world. It is probable that we shall lose more men in this war, even though the victory is ours, than we have ever lost in any other war. This we must be prepared to face. We must face another fact. We shall lose fewer women in proportion to these men than other countries will lose, with the possible exception of Canada. England, Australia, China, India have been and probably will be heavily bombed, and men, women, and children will die together. It is not likely that we shall be bombed in anything like the same measure. Our civilian population will not suffer so much as these others have or will, and the inevitable result will be that after the war we shall have a considerably larger proportion of women to men in our population than we have ever had before—or perhaps than any country will have.

Let American women then face the future clearly. The real sacrifice they will make is not in today when they send their menfolk away to war, and must send them, for there is no escape from it. The real sacrifice is not that today they come out of their sheltered homes to work in factories and defense jobs. The real sacrifice for this war being fought today will be made tomorrow, when thousands of women will have to face life alone because the men they might have married are dead. For a generation there must be many women who will face

WOMEN AND VICTORY

a life of loneliness and of homelessness, in the sense that man and woman make a home together. I do not speak of the widows of men who are killed—I speak of the young girls now in colleges and high schools, those not yet quite ready or not at all ready for marriage and who will never have the chance to marry. They will have jobs, probably, because there will be much work to do after this war. They will have bread to eat and pretty clothes to wear. But they will live alone.

English women knew something of this loneliness after the last world war, but it will be easier for them this time. So many English women have already been killed, and many more will be killed before this war is over. It is American women who will have to take their turn at loneliness after this war.

You may ask me why I speak of this now. I speak of it because I believe in being ready for life. Too many great opportunities are lost because people are not ready for them and do not recognize them. I suppose the most tragic opportunity ever lost was at the end of the last war when we had the chance to enter the League of Nations as an active force in the world. Our leaders were ready for it. President Wilson saw to the full the greatness of our opportunity. But our people were not ready. They had not foreseen what might be

AMERICAN UNITY AND ASIA

at the end of the war. They had been entirely absorbed in the war itself—to win it, they thought.

But they did not win it. They lost, for we are fighting the war again today and it is a more desperate war this time because of the lost opportunity.

Why did we lose? Because our people had not thought about peace except as an end to war and a return to the old ways. What they did not know is what we ought now to know, that there is never a return to old ways after war. It cannot be, for the people who are alive after war are not the same people who were living before. Many of them are dead, and all are changed. If the last war can teach us anything, and indeed it must teach us much, let it teach us that we cannot expect the same world after the war and that we must get ready now for that new world, for it will begin at once. Peace comes always suddenly, and we are never ready for it, any more than we were ready for war. But it is easier to get ready for war. The things we need for war are so concrete—weapons made of metal, ships and airplanes, the training of men in the simple specific ways of being soldiers. Even victory in war is a concrete thing, a cessation of fighting, conqueror and the conquered.

But victory in peace is very difficult. It is not simple, it is not concrete, it has no material weapons, and to

WOMEN AND VICTORY

teach people to think clearly and to feel rightly is far more difficult than teaching them to march nicely and shoot straight. We cannot begin too soon, therefore, to think of victory in peace. Especially is it true that women cannot begin to think too soon of victory in peace, because there will be many more women than men after the war is over; victory in peace will depend upon women more than upon men.

It will depend more upon women not merely because of their greater numbers, however. It will depend more upon them because of the peculiar problems which will come upon women as a result of the war, problems which men cannot share, because of the great separation between men and women which war always brings. And I speak of these things now, because we who are mothers must begin now to prepare our young daughters for their lives after the war, and those who are teachers must begin to prepare their young women students.

Here then is what we must tell them in one way and another as we train them for life ahead. The war will make it impossible for all of them to marry and to have the life which we consider normal. After the war many women must live without homes, without husbands, without children. This is a fact which young women must face.

They may face it in one of two ways. If they are self-

AMERICAN UNITY AND ASIA

seeking, if they are selfish and careless of their duty to their times and their country and blind to the opportunities for humanity, if they want only to get what they can for themselves, then women can reduce life to an undignified struggle for marriage. That will mean that several women will lay hold of one man. You know that strange passage in the Bible, a passage I used to puzzle my head over when I was a child in a minister's house, "In that day," the old prophet said, "seven women shall lay hold of one man." I understand it better now. He meant, after a great war, women, if they yield merely to their instincts, will want at any price their normal relationships to men. These are perfectly right instincts in their place, but all wrong when they are not subjected to reason.

What will be the result of this competition for men and marriage when women greatly outnumber men? It will be a loss of all the personal quality and value of women as individuals. You and I have seen and deplored the same sort of thing on a small scale in our society now. It is true that even now women want marriage far more than men do, partly by nature, partly for economic reasons. I have spoken elsewhere of the waste that I see in women's lives in the years between eighteen and thirty, a period which men use for productive training and work and which women use primarily as

WOMEN AND VICTORY

a husband-hunting time. Only after they succeed or definitely fail do they turn to some sort of work. Now, I do not blame women for this, although I think they are wrong. They are wrong when they look on marriage as an economic benefit, as too many of them do, especially among the less intelligent, who shrink from competition and struggle in the world of human work. They make a mistake, too, psychologically, when they think of marriage as security for themselves. But into that I will not enter now. I only mention the fact that it was already the situation in times of peace, when men and women are about equal in numbers, that women devoted their best efforts in their best years to achieve marriage. What will it be then when there are far fewer men than women? Unless our education for women is radically changed, it will be a very bad state of affairs, not only for women, but for the nation as a whole when the war is over.

For what affects women affects most deeply the whole people. If many women compete with each other for a few men—let us put it as baldly as that, for that is what it is, no less—the place and power of men will be exalted out of all proportion, and we shall inevitably have a fascist relationship between men and women, that is, an artificial weight in favor of man. What a man says will be worth much more than what a woman

AMERICAN UNITY AND ASIA

says, for there will be so few men. Even if a man is a fool he will be revered and listened to, for will he not be a man? Women's instincts are tricky things at best. Nature puts the strongest sex urge not in man but in woman, for woman carries on the race, and man is a necessity to her if she is to complete the cycle of her life as a woman. Man needs woman primarily for himself, but woman needs man for herself and the child. Hers is the double necessity. When society adds to this double need the tremendous demand for economic security in the home, where man supports woman and gives her food and shelter and freedom from outside struggle and responsibility, the need of woman for man becomes clamor and competition and jealousy, and there is all the disgraceful behavior of reason put aside and of selfish instinct rampant.

This is what will happen after the war among women on a scale demoralizing to the nation unless we begin now to train the young girls who have to live through it. They are already born, already going to school, some of them, and already old enough to learn.

Let us teach these who must be the women of the post-war era of the difficulties which they must face and which they cannot escape because of this war. Let us teach them that if they face these difficulties rebel-

WOMEN AND VICTORY

liously, with the determination to think only of themselves, the result will be social chaos.

Let us teach our young girls boldly the truth, and tell them that no happiness can come even to them as individuals in such a society. For with the premium that will be set on men by such behavior no man will be securely any woman's possession. Life for the woman will be one continual struggle to hold what she can get, an undignified, degrading struggle that will last as long as she lives. Polygamy would be the only solution, and anyone who has lived in a country where polygamy is the rule knows that it is no solution for the happiness of either woman or man.

No, upon women depends the victory in peace. Women can make us lose the peace.

But there is another way for women to face the future put upon their generation. It is the way of full knowledge and acceptance of the sacrifice. It is the way of determination that life can and must be lived in dignity and usefulness under circumstances which deny women legitimate instincts for marriage and children. It is the way of acceptance and of dedication of the individual to the greater good. If women will, if they are ready for it, mentally and spiritually, they can make in the age after the war their greatest contribution to humankind and human affairs. Relieved, however sor-

AMERICAN UNITY AND ASIA

rowfully, of the ties and labors that keep women at home in other times, there will be many free women—women free, that is, to apply themselves to national and international affairs, to correcting evils in our society, to building business and new business ethics, to better government and practical and just administration. There will be women who can be free to enter management and enter the leadership of labor, women free to go into science and medicine and the arts and all those places where women have entered so little or not at all.

After the war it will be woman's chance to see if she can make a better place out of the world. She ought to make her sacrifice into opportunity and so glorify the sacrifice and give it worth. I am not one of those who ever wastes a moment on trying to prove that woman is man's equal. It is an idle question, and fit only for the subject of jokes. It has been a subject for jokes the world over. You know the many American ones, I am sure, but there are the same ones in any country. It was a Chinese proverb which first said, "A man thinks he knows, but a woman knows better." It is part of the Chinese man's real greatness that he laughs but he laughs with admiration of woman when he says this. Women are respected in China, not because they are like men, but because as women they are such admi-

WOMEN AND VICTORY

rable human beings. As a matter of fact the Chinese with their usual wisdom never have disputes on this matter of male and female equality. Men and women alike, they consider the question academic nonsense, as indeed it is. How can you have two different entities equal to each other? The value of a woman would be lost if she were the same as a man, and a man's value if he were the same as a woman. The balanced society needs the work of both, and Chinese society has been very balanced indeed for many centuries.

Ours has not been so balanced. Our national life is run by men on masculine principles, and women are fellow travelers. We could do with a good deal more in our nation's character of the qualities which go to make up the woman's nature. That wise Chinese, Lin Yutang, says:

Indeed the Chinese mind is akin to the feminine mind in many respects. . . . The qualities of the feminine intelligence and feminine logic are exactly the qualities of the Chinese mind. The Chinese head, like the feminine head, is full of common sense. It is shy of abstract terms, like women's speech. The Chinese way of thinking is synthetic, concrete, and revels in proverbs, like women's conversation. . . . Women have a surer instinct of life than men have, and the Chinese have it more than any other people. The Chinese depend largely upon their intuition for solving all of nature's mysteries, that same "intuition" or "sixth sense" which makes many women believe a thing

AMERICAN UNITY AND ASIA

is so because it is so. And Chinese logic is like women's logic . . . a Chinese judge cannot think of law as an abstract entity but as a flexible quantity as it should be personally applied to Mr. Huang or Dr. Li. Accordingly, (to a Chinese) any law which is not personal enough to respond to the personality of Mr. Huang and Dr. Li is inhuman and therefore no law at all. Chinese justice is an art and not a science. . . .

Common sense and the practical mind are characteristics of women rather than of men. It is men who are more liable to take their feet off the ground and soar to impossible heights. . . . With the Chinese, as with women, the concrete always takes the place of the abstract.

I quote these passages because they show that in China a whole nation has been permeated by feminine influence and to its benefit. The proof of this permeation is not merely in what Dr. Lin says, but in the very fact that he says it without the slightest self-consciousness. No American man would be willing to say that his country was feminine in its qualities. But a Chinese says it without any sense of shame because Chinese men admire and value the qualities of Chinese women, and consider them of value equal to their own and indispensable to the people. An American man would think that to call America feminine in its qualities would signify weakness, lack of courage, and lack of virile strength. This sort of thing does not occur to a Chinese man who knows Chinese women. And certainly China,

WOMEN AND VICTORY

as the only power which today has successfully fought against the Japanese, can scarcely be said to be lacking in strength.

Let us therefore teach our young women that they must look on the period after the war as their period of great opportunity, not only as women, but as human beings. If marriage comes their way in the ordinary course, good, but it cannot come to all, and must not be counted upon by any either as a life work or as an economic recourse. Above all, women must not feel themselves to have failed in their femininity because they do not achieve marriage. It may be a good thing for women as a whole to pass through a period when marriage is impossible for so many of them that none can be blamed for not achieving it. It is now certainly too often a criterion of social and personal success.

What use can women then make of their lives in the period when men are being born and nature is catching up with the devastation of war in our country?

There are certain places where women can and ought to set to work as soon as possible with their practical experience. One place is in the matter of food administration. The relation in the world between supply and demand in food has never yet been considered in terms of human need. It has been considered always in terms of marketing, of money-making, and of

AMERICAN UNITY AND ASIA

profits, but never in terms of human need first. There are whole areas where people habitually do not get enough to eat or the right food to eat, although we are in other places throwing food away. This is no simple problem and no unimportant one. Much of the discontent in the world would be removed if everybody had food. Food distribution involves economic situations and profit situations which are entangled in the national system. But to approach food from the human point of view would be a basic approach.

Again, education of the young, already so much in the hands of women, will be increasingly their duty after the war. It will be in their power to plan a new education of the young, an education which will have its share toward training for a permanent peace and the elimination of war, an international education. Children will have their heads full of war thoughts and war talk and their memories full of war experiences which will bear the same bitter fruit unless the minds are re-educated.

But what is most important of all, woman should be working at this very moment in the field where she has the most knowledge and is the most skilful—that of human relations. Today the peoples of the world are compelled into closer intimacy than they are ready to bear. Even before the war mechanical communications

WOMEN AND VICTORY

hurried us closer than we had ever been before. Seven days between the capital of our country and Chungking, the inner capital of China, a distance that we had been accustomed to thinking of as many weeks; ten days to India, instead of months; two days and less to Europe; four or five days to Russia—we were not mentally or spiritually ready for such intimacy. The peoples of these countries were strangers to us. Then came the enforced intimacy of war, and among our allies are peoples of whom we have scarcely heard. China we know better than any of our allies in Asia, and yet actually we know almost nothing of the people of China. We know nothing of Japan, today our enemy, and yet it is very important to know an enemy, as well as a friend.

This ignorance cannot continue if we are to have a stable world after the war. It ought not to be allowed to continue any longer now when we are fighting side by side with these peoples. We must know them to win them for victory. How many of us know anything about India, for instance, except the meager accounts given in the newspapers, through British sources? I think that British censorship is on the whole very fair, but censorship is censorship, and you may be sure that India's leaders could not have united as they did unite in refusing the British proposals without very sound reasons on their side.

AMERICAN UNITY AND ASIA

To know why the people of India decided as they did, to face the practical effects of such a disastrous decision upon our war effort, to realize the necessity of reopening the discussion in India and trying again to come to some mutual understanding and agreement: this is the sort of thing that women ought to be doing because they can do it best. And yet so far as most of the women of this country are concerned, it seems they do not know India exists or has any relation to the war or to our world. And yet it is true that India has far more to do with our American war and our victory and our life in the world tomorrow than the endless knitting we do and the programs of amusement for soldiers that we busy ourselves with and all the petty details of our present contribution to the war. These details are good and essential, but we ought to be doing them with our left hands while our right hands and our brains and our wills are absorbed in those great basic solutions which alone will end the problems of war and peace. Woman ought to be pre-eminent in every place where interpretation of one people to another is necessary, and for that pre-eminence she must have the necessary knowledge and the necessary breadth of view. Women ought to be in the power places of the world so that in the management of life women's gifts can be of value to all human beings.

WOMEN AND VICTORY

University women are privileged by having been given the best opportunities for education and understanding. We ought to be leading, and leaders not only in little local organizations, in rolling bandages and raising Red Cross funds and sending bundles to Britain and relief to China and going on volunteer duty to drive officers around. But we are the ones who ought to be able and active at this very moment in making it possible for our country to take steps to bring India again into discussion with Britain. We ought to be the ones who are moving to cement the relationships with China, our staunch and essential ally in the Pacific. How many of us know that the laws against Chinese immigration into this country are stricter than the laws against Japanese? A Chinese in a high position told me the other day that if we would now revise our immigration laws to put China on a quota, even though the quota would allow only a few hundred to come in every year, the impression of good will made on China would be enormous. This is something for women to change.

In one State at least the Chinese children are not allowed to go to schools with white children. The Chinese have protested, but nothing is done about it. Why? Some say because the Chinese keep grocery stores, and the big grocery stores owned by white men want to run

AMERICAN UNITY AND ASIA

them out of business by making home conditions unpleasant for them. It is evil enough to have segregation among our citizens, but to extend that segregation to exclude the children of our allies from our schools is a threat to our unity in the war effort. And be sure all of these injustices are known abroad, not only to our ally China, but to our enemy Japan. Such injustices have penetrated the Indian mind, and have made millions of Indians troubled. They ask themselves if Americans, too, are an imperialistic people, determined to rule over the colored peoples.

And what of the feeling between the Arabs and the Jews, between the Russians and our own people, between the African colonies and their rulers, or even between the groups in our own country? All this is our business. Indeed, all that is human is our business. We cannot, we women of intelligence and training, consider that we have fulfilled our function by limiting ourselves, our time and our thought, to small local affairs. There is the world waiting for the very sort of thing which it is our function to give. And certainly in the field of better human relationships in the world woman has no competition with man, for nothing has been done. Our international affairs have been governed solely by the mercantile minds of business men.

But to do such great work after the war women must

WOMEN AND VICTORY

stretch their minds and their spirits. They must forget their little personal securities and personal longings and ambitions, and think far beyond themselves if they are to be ready for the new world which victory will bring. A little five-year-old of mine the other day was preparing to paint on a huge sheet of blank paper. She paused a moment. "What is it?" I asked her. "Don't you know what you want to paint?" "I do know," she said. "But I want to make it big, and so first I have to think big."

That is what all women have to do before they put hand to the great jobs of tomorrow. We have to think big—not what can I get out of it for myself, my own pride, my little personal success, but what can I do for the world in my lifetime, with my life, which, by a circumstance, is all I am to have?

Think big for tomorrow, women of intelligence and wisdom, and think big, teachers of the women who are to be. Tomorrow will take big thinking, because it will take big doing. Out of what they think and how they will, women can make tomorrow what they will. If they think too small they can make of tomorrow a personal disaster and a national calamity.

But if women think big they can make for the whole world a victory out of peace.

10. AMERICAN UNITY

THERE is much stress these days, and very proper stress, upon the word unity. We are told on every hand that above all we must have unity if we are to win this war. We are told that Hitler counts upon our disunity as one of our great weaknesses. We are urged to unity, therefore, and it is even said by those who urge us that unity is one of the strengths of fascism, and the lack of unity one of the weaknesses of democracy which we must somehow overcome.

Before we accept this, however, let us examine into it. What is unity? From the fascist point of view it is similarity in all individuals, a similarity which expressing itself in similar action springs from similarity of mind behind the unified action. This similarity of mind is obtained by rigid exclusion of all who refuse to conform to it even to the death of the individual who will not submit. All must think alike, says the fascist, in order that all may act alike, and force is applied to compel like thought and like action.

A speech delivered at Manhattan Center, New York, April 8, 1942.

AMERICAN UNITY

From the democratic point of view, some similarity of action is also necessary, to a certain extent at all times and certainly in times of war. But it is not necessary for that action to proceed out of exactly similar minds. Democracy accepts the individual, his difference from every other individual in thought and in modes of behavior. In war, however, in order to gather together the necessary force of action, there must be concerted action, in order to defend and to extend freedom. Obviously now we must be willing to forego some of our accustomed freedoms in order to fight for freedom itself. But democracy seeks for that concerted action from a source different from the sources of fascist strength. The source of unity in democracies is in the individual's will. It is *his will* to unite, and not the compulsion upon him of those above him, that produces what is the strongest unity in the world, the union of free men.

It is not true, therefore, that unity is a strength of fascism and lack of unity a weakness in democracy. The most democratic people in the world, the Chinese, present in times of peace an apparent lack of unity which appalls the orderly minded. Even Sun Yat-sen once, in despair at the reluctance of his people to join together, exclaimed that his people were like grains of loose sand. He meant it in disparagement but actually he spoke more truly than he knew. When sand all blows

AMERICAN UNITY AND ASIA

the same way, there is a cohesion, not only of material, but of force which can overcome anything. Anyone who has ever been in sand storms knows that sand plus wind is simply invincible. It not only stops all progress of machine and man, but it can overcome the landscape itself, as it has done in whole sections of north China where the wind, blowing the Gobi desert sands, is inexorably making desert of what was once fertile farm land. Or, to use an example of our own, what force is more powerful than that applied to loose particles of sand in what we call sand-blasting?

Fascist union is the union that comes from docile man-made bricks, laid together by fascist cement, but democratic union is the union of the sandstorm, united by the force of the will which is in the persistent electric wind. The orderly building of the fascist seems very useful, but sand can bury cities now as it has in the past. It can wear away stone.

Let us reject at once, therefore, the idea of the fascist type of unity in individuals. Indeed we must reject it. If we attempt to build the sort of unity the fascists have built, we must first become fascists and then there is no use in fighting the war. The fascists will have won it anyway. Here is the horrible subtlety of this war, as Hitler very well knows and has already boasted. Fascism conquered France without war. There was not even

AMERICAN UNITY

time for a civil war. The fascists took the government before the people knew it. This can happen in any democracy and Hitler knows it. It can happen in England, it can happen here. Curiously it is less possible in China than in any other country, and for the very reason which nearly drove Sun Yat-sen mad when he tried to get that vast heap of individual grains of sand to unite into a revolution. Even if fascists should get hold of the Chinese government, the people are so individualistic, so accustomed to thinking for themselves, that again they will remain grains of sand. Nothing, no power on earth, can make the Chinese people into bricks. The utter lack of regimentation in China, the very lack of political cohesion which our federalists deplore, is the one thing which makes the people of China safer than any of us for democracy.

Yet no people on earth are as united today in war as the Chinese people. An immense force has started the sand storm—it is the force of the will of the people. To a man the Chinese are determined to defeat Japan and to keep their nation free. All individuals in China are united on this—not suppressed, mind you, not regimented into any kind of similarity, but united by force of will and by the conviction of the necessity of Japan's defeat and the necessity of their own freedom.

Compare this with the unity that is in Japan, a typi-

AMERICAN UNITY AND ASIA

cal fascist unity. In Japan the citizens do not and dare not think, much less express individual opinion. The military mind is in control of all—a mind which when it is united with fascism becomes the greatest danger that humanity has ever faced in its whole history since creation. There is perfect cohesion in Japan, perfect unity. But it has not been able to defeat the unity which is China today.

What of ourselves? We Americans have not, of course, the sort of unity which Japan has. We must never have it. We must not, we people of America, of every race and creed, allow any of those who govern us ever to tell us that it is our weakness that we have not the unity of fascist nations. When any one tells us that, let us shout back at him that such unity as the fascists have is a weakness and not a strength, a death and not a life. It means a people defeated and not a people triumphant, and we people of America, of the United States, will have none of it.

And yet the sort of natural unity which China has is something which we have not. The Chinese can afford to be very individual because they have natural unity. They can afford to exist without much political unity, as indeed they have in the past, and do in the present, because they have so much and such ancient natural unity—unity of race, for instance, even to a similarity

AMERICAN UNITY

in coloring of hair and skin, unity of the longest continuing history in the human story, unity of customs and social ideals, unity in tolerance of religious beliefs, unity in family structure. But we have not these natural and national unities, and we cannot therefore compare ourselves to the Chinese. They are a people so homogeneous, so united in fundamentals, that they have expanded into a practical democracy of centuries' duration. They have not needed to approach democracy through political forms.

But ours is a very different case from that of the Chinese. Here upon a large piece of the earth there have assembled, more or less desultorily and certainly without a commonly expressed agreement, people from almost every nation and race. We had nothing in common, not even a determination to escape to freedom. Many of our ancestors came here in the simple hope of bettering their material fortunes. They had no idealistic notions of freedom. They came, these motley folk, each bringing his own religion, his own ancestry of race and nation, his own political beliefs, his own ambitions. Our people were individuals indeed, solitary, fending each for himself in what to him was a wilderness. And this all happened in very recent times. We have no centuries of common history behind us—a couple of

AMERICAN UNITY AND ASIA

scant centuries of struggle with land and with each other in which to build our nation.

Obviously, therefore, now that we are at war, we have a harder task to unite than the Chinese have had. With all the will in the world we have practical difficulties which they have not. They have been able to be a decentralized sort of democracy, because they came out of a common soil. We did not come out of a common soil, and we must find our unity not in an ancient common history, not in an ancient common family system, not in ancient common religion, not in a common race. We have none of these unities.

Where is our unity, then? It is primarily in our form of government. Feeling our natural disunities, we have evolved a form of government which provides for our individual differences and yet unifies us politically. In our system of state and federal governments we have made something democratic, which, however inadequately it functions at times, yet provides a framework which functions well for us in peacetime—better I think than any other government in the world, because it provides for freedom of the individual and for growth. It keeps the governor the servant of the governed, and that is real democracy.

But in wartime our scheme of government seems not to function so well—or so we are being told. We are

AMERICAN UNITY

told by many persons impatient for action in war that the form of government which safeguards us in peace is a danger in war. It is too cumbersome, we are told. It is necessary in times of war, we are told, to have one person who is responsible for a given task and in absolute command of all the materials and forces necessary to accomplish that task. Checks and counterchecks must be removed, we are told, if we are to win a war.

Now this brings us, as Americans, to a dilemma. We are afraid of power centralized in the hands of one person at any time and in any place. And yet we are being told that this centralization is necessary in order to win the war. What shall we do? Our hesitation, our apparent lack of unity now, is really an evidence of the deep unity of our hearts. For we believe in the democratic form of government. We believe in what we have had, space and freedom for all races, all parties, and freedom of criticism and expression of feeling and thought. This is the core of our national life. We are afraid to hand it over to those who may change it even in the name of necessity, and who have the power to enforce those changes. In short, we are in the position of a man whose house is being besieged by a band of robbers. A man whose name he may know, but whose heart he does not, comes to save him, but insists on being given the gun. The man of the house has to make the choice between

AMERICAN UNITY AND ASIA

the approaching robbers, who outnumber him, and the man standing before him who wants his gun in order to help him.

"What will I have if I hand over my gun?" the householder asks himself. Shall he or shall he not hand over the gun? Will this man or he be in possession of his house if he does?

In this dilemma are the real roots of our apparent present disunity. Let us examine those roots for a moment. If we can find out the cause of disunity we may be able to remove them and prepare for unity.

Why is it that we are so careful about preserving the forms of democracy and the Chinese are so careless about them? Partly it is because the Chinese says of any other citizen of his country, "Well, he's Chinese, after all, like me. We are of the same blood. Our ancestors lived together here even as we are doing." That is, the Chinese has a basic trust in every other Chinese, a sort of family trust. We have not that trust in each other and cannot have. We look at an American rising in power, and remember that he came, perhaps only a generation ago, from a country which had no ideals of democracy. He has been reared, perhaps, in an individual family tradition of undemocratic family life. Or we distrust a man because he has been reared in the tradition of the very wealthy in this country, what we call

AMERICAN UNITY

the capitalist, the great industrialist, the powerful. In China the very wealthy are still within the common unities of blood, family, and national culture. There are few great industrialists in China—none now—and even when there were, Chinese culture was as powerful upon them as any. They could not gain the individual power that such men have in our country. The common man was not so afraid of them. They were also Chinese. Even when they dickered with the Japanese as warlords, even when they have turned into traitors like Wang Ching-wei, they still are Chinese. There are many Chinese who believe that Wang Ching-wei even now is playing a Chinese game in the long run, and they let him play it without too much condemnation. The Chinese are sure of their own being. Their roots are very deep.

But we are not so sure—we cannot be so sure. It would not be safe. Our roots are shallow. We have grown up very quickly and flowered very splendidly upon those shallow roots, but we are uneasily aware that the roots may not be strong enough for such growth. We want to be sure that the roots are fed and kept alive. We do not want to do anything which cuts at the democratic roots of our nation. Our people are wise in their hesitation. They want to be sure that the one thing which makes them a great democratic people, their form of government, is not lost from within while

AMERICAN UNITY AND ASIA

they fight fascism without. This is our great unity. Let us keep it, maintain it, and refuse under any terms to part with it. Better to be defeated in war and go down fighting as a democracy than to yield up our democracy in the hope that we can thereby save it, and be lost before the battle is begun.

The cause of uncertainty in the American people now, therefore, is not lack of unity, it is lack of trust in each other. We all want the same thing, all of us, Gentiles and Jews, black and white, Catholic and Protestant, north and south, east and west, but we are not sure of each other's democracy. We distrust the genuineness not only of the individual but even of the class or the race. Thus labor distrusts capital, and capital certainly distrusts labor. The Jew distrusts the Gentile and the Gentile distrusts the Jew. Black distrusts white and white distrusts black—that is, they distrust the democratic determination in each other. We carry each of us in our hearts a torch, our belief in democracy as the hope of the human race, but we cannot see the torch burning in another's heart, and we ask ourselves, "Is it there?" It is this distrust which holds back our war effort. Instead of uniting against the enemy, we are fearful lest the enemy is in our capital, in our town, and even next door to us.

This situation among us we must now face in view of

AMERICAN UNITY

the solemn necessity upon us of unity in war. That unity is a necessity I think we must all agree. We must not hold back in any way from the fullest co-operation to win this war. But the heart of free man is his strength. He will not be able to put forth his fullest effort unless he believes. We must somehow get that force of belief in each other which the Chinese have by inheritance before we are going to get the greatest force into our war effort. How shall we get it?

Not, I believe, by giving up any of the weapons of democracy, not by giving up the gun to anybody. What is the gun? It is the right to free speech, the right to criticize, to say what we think. I know what is too often said these days, that we give comfort to the enemy when we criticize our government and each other. I say then let the enemy have that comfort. It does not matter what comfort we give him of that sort if our armies are winning by land and our ships by sea and our planes in the air—it is cold comfort if he hears us criticize each other under such circumstances. And what we have to remember is that being free people, a people accustomed to freedom, nothing will so take the heart out of us for fighting a war for freedom as to have freedom taken away from us at home. No, let us not give the gun to anybody.

We do well to distrust each other. We must distrust

AMERICAN UNITY AND ASIA

each other. We were not born into one family, we Americans. We did not have the same father and mother, as the Chinese did. We are not a democracy of blood as they are. But we are that even more powerful union, a democracy by conviction, a sworn brotherhood, a union of the mind and the will. We are determined for democracy, and in that one will is our great union, our great strength. Let us accept this as our bond, and then test its very warp and woof in the individual. But to apply that test of union, let us never give up, to anybody, at home or abroad, the very tool for test. If we cannot speak, if we cannot complain, if we cannot criticize and suggest and demand, we give up the war for democracy before it is ever carried beyond our own gates.

Let us accept therefore our attitude of mutual distrust as a valuable asset to our democracy, and not as a danger. Let us not fear to speak out against anyone or to be spoken against by anyone. It is a sign of weakness to fear to speak or to wish to suppress those who would speak. When a government or a man wants to suppress the voice that has cried out against it or him, it is time to examine that government or that man. The people of America must keep the right of such examination.

What then—are we to continue in this state of perpetual doubt and distrust of each other? Can anything

AMERICAN UNITY

be accomplished for victory in this war if we do? Let us realize first that nothing will be accomplished anyway if we give up the right to distrust and to speak out our distrust. If we are reduced to silence we will be reduced to lifelessness. There will be no force left in us. Apathy and sullenness will not win the war either, and apathy and sullenness would be the result of suppression here as anywhere, and there would be results far more serious than those before long. No, war can only be won by concerted action based on united determination of the mind and the emotions of the people, and these can only come about through the fullest freedom. If there is any doubt of this, judge by what would happen if suppressions and concentrations of power were put into force over our people of which they did not approve. Their rebellion would soon dissipate any war effort. They would, and very rightly, start fighting the war against fascism at home instead of abroad.

No, the point is not to stop democracy anywhere but to let it act more freely. What is causing disunity among our people is not too much democracy but the fear of too little. Our people need to be reassured, not suppressed. They are on guard not against Germany and Italy and Japan, but against fascism. They do well to be on guard. For fascism does not grow by nations or by races. It grows by individuals of a certain kind who

AMERICAN UNITY AND ASIA

may be found anywhere. They opened the gates to the enemy in Spain, in Norway, in France, in all those places where the enemy stands entrenched today. These men must not be allowed to open our gates. We must not give up our distrust therefore of each other as individuals. It is right that any and all, and especially when we put them in any place of power over us, should be subjected to the severest tests of distrust. If anyone objects to those tests, if he does not want to be examined and criticized and spoken for and against, then he is not our man. He is not willing to be subjected to democratic processes. It is he who disturbs our fundamental unity.

But there is a sort of distrust which is undemocratic because it disunifies. It is dangerous because it does aid and abet the enemy, and we as true Americans must recognize and reject it in ourselves, wherever it is found. It is the distrust between groups, between races, between creeds, between political parties, between social groups and economic groups. This is the distrust which the enemy is building upon when he tells the colored American that the white American will never give him equality, and tells the white American that the Negro is a menace and a danger, when he tells the Jew that there is a rising anti-semitism here, and tells the Gentile that the Jew is creeping into all the high places, when he tells the Protestant that the Catholic

AMERICAN UNITY

church is a fascist organization, and tells the Catholic that the Protestant is against him as a Catholic because the Pope is Italian, when he tells men that women are getting too powerful and encourages the making of a man's league such as exists in England today among men who say that women, English women, are more dangerous to the national life than Hitler is, the enemy who tells woman that she ought to go back to the home where she belongs and that she is not fit to take part in the national life. In short, the distrust between groups of human beings we must sternly reject not only as aid to the enemy but as denying our own democracy.

For it is essential to democracy that the individual is the unit and not the group. We are not groups—we are individuals. We are not governed by groups but by individuals of our own choosing. There is no need for us to stand together as groups if ours is a true democracy. Indeed we must not—we are lost if we belong first to a group and then to a nation, for that is what the fascist does. If we belong to a group then we cannot belong to the nation. The heart is already divided.

Let the loyal men and women of America today prove themselves as Americans. Let each of us say, "I maintain the tradition of my country. It does not matter to me what color a person's skin is, black or white or yellow, it does not matter whether a person is Jew or Gentile,

AMERICAN UNITY AND ASIA

Catholic or Protestant, man or woman. If he believes in freedom and in human equality he is a good American and I will trust him."

Not the trust in class or creed or race or sex that fascism has, but trust in each other as individuals—in such trust we find our unity.

